ମହାତ୍ମାଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଓ ରାଜନୀତି



ଓଡ଼ିଶା ରାଜ୍ୟ ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ସଂସଦ ଉପସମିତ

୨ । ୧୦ । ୧୯୬୯

ମହାତ୍ମା ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଓ ରାଜନୀତି



ସତ୍ୟ ପ୍ରେମ ଅହିଂସା

ଓଡ଼ିଶା ରାଜ୍ୟ ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ସଂସଦ ଉପସମିତି

୨ । ୧୦ । ୧୯୬୯

ଓଡ଼ିଶା ରାଜ୍ୟ ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ସଂସଦ ଉପସମିତି

୧—ଶ୍ରୀଯୁକ୍ତ ବନମାଳୀ ପଟ୍ଟନାୟକ—ଶିକ୍ଷାମନ୍ତ୍ରୀ—ସଭାପତି,

୨— ,, ଶତ୍ରୁଘ୍ନ ନାଥ ସମ୍ପାଦକ

୩— ,, ରତନ ଦାସ ,,

୪—ଡକ୍ଟର ସଦାଶିବ ମିଶ୍ର ସଦସ୍ୟ

୫—ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ଭୁବନାନନ୍ଦ ରାୟ ,,

୬—ଡକ୍ଟର ବୈଦ୍ୟନାଥ ମିଶ୍ର ,,

୭—ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ମୁକୁନ୍ଦ ମିଶ୍ର ,,

୮—ଶ୍ରୀଯୁକ୍ତ ସୁଧାଂଶୁ ଶେଖର ଦାସ ,,

୯— ,, ବଧୂଭୂଷଣ ଦାସ ,,

୧୦—ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ହୃଦାନନ୍ଦ ରାୟ ,,

୧୧—ଶ୍ରୀଯୁକ୍ତ କୃଷ୍ଣନାଥ ରଥ ,,

୧୨—ଶ୍ରୀଯୁକ୍ତା ସୁମିତ୍ରା ଚୌଧୁରୀ ,,

୧୩—ଶ୍ରୀଯୁକ୍ତ ବୈଦ୍ୟନାଥ ରଥ ,,

ମୁଖବନ୍ଧ

ସଂସଦ, ଆଲୋଚନାଚକ୍ର, ପ୍ରବନ୍ଧ ଲିଖନ ମାଧ୍ୟମରେ ବୁଦ୍ଧିଜୀବୀ, ଶିକ୍ଷାବିତ୍ ଓ ଶିକ୍ଷାର୍ଥୀମାନଙ୍କ ମଧ୍ୟରେ ମହାତ୍ମା ଗାନ୍ଧୀଙ୍କର ବିଚାର ଉପସ୍ଥାପନ କରିବା ଓଡ଼ିଶା ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ସଂସଦ ଉପସମିତିର ପ୍ରଧାନ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟ । ଏଥିପାଇଁ ଓଡ଼ିଶାର ବିଭିନ୍ନ ଶିକ୍ଷାନୁଷ୍ଠାନ ଓ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟରେ ସଂସଦ ଓ ଆଲୋଚନାଚକ୍ର ଆଦି କରାଯାଉଅଛି । ଏତଦ୍‌ବ୍ୟତୀତ ଗ୍ରାମାଞ୍ଚଳରେ ମଧ୍ୟ ଯୁବଶିବିର ଓ ଆଲୋଚନା ସଭା ଆଦିର ଆୟୋଜନ ହେଉଅଛି ।

ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ଅବଧି ମଧ୍ୟରେ ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ବିଚାର ଧାରାର ବିଭିନ୍ନ ଦିଗପ୍ରତି ଦୃଷ୍ଟି ଦିଆଯାଇ ଆଲୋଚନା ପାଇଁ ବିଷୟ ସ୍ଥିର କରାଯାଉଅଛି । ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରୀୟ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ସଂସଦ ଉପସମିତି ବିଚାରଧାରାର ବିଷୟ ସମ୍ବନ୍ଧରେ ସୂଚନା ନିମ୍ନ ପ୍ରକାରେ ଦେଇଛନ୍ତି ।

୧—ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ଶିକ୍ଷାପ୍ରତି ଅବଦାନ ।
୨—ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ରାଜନୀତି ପ୍ରତି ଅବଦାନ ।
୩—ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ଅର୍ଥନୀତି ପ୍ରତି ଅବଦାନ ।
୪—ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ଧର୍ମ ଓ ଦର୍ଶନ ପ୍ରତି ଅବଦାନ ।
୫—ଉପଜାତି ଓ ଅବହେଳିତ ଜନତାଙ୍କର ଉତ୍ଥାନ ପାଇଁ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ଅବଦାନ ।

୧୯୬୯ ମସିହା ଫେବୃୟାରୀ ୧୭ ଓ ୧୮ ତାରିଖରେ ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ, ବାଣୀବିହାରଠାରେ "ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ରାଜନୀତି ପ୍ରତି ଅବଦାନ" ବିଷୟ ଉପରେ ଯେଉଁ ରାଜ୍ୟସ୍ତରୀୟ ସଂସଦ ଅନୁଷ୍ଠିତ ହୋଇଥିଲା ସେଥିରେ ପଠିତ କେତୋଟି ପ୍ରବନ୍ଧ ଏହି ପୁସ୍ତକରେ ପ୍ରକାଶ ପାଉଅଛି । ଏହି ସଂସଦକୁ ଓଡ଼ିଶାର ଶିକ୍ଷାମନ୍ତ୍ରୀ ତଥା ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଶତବାର୍ଷିକୀ ସଂସଦ ଉପସମିତିର ସଭାପତି ଶ୍ରୀ ବନମାଳୀ ପଟ୍ଟନାୟକ ଉଦ୍‌ଘାଟନ କରିଥିଲେ ।

ପ୍ରଥମ ଦିନ ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟର କୁଳପତି ଡକ୍ଟର ସଦାଶିବ ମିଶ୍ର ଓ ଦ୍ୱିତୀୟ ଦିନ ରାଜନୀତି ବିଜ୍ଞାନର ମୁଖ୍ୟ ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ଡକ୍ଟର ଶ୍ରୀରାମଚନ୍ଦ୍ର ଦାଶ ସଭାପତିତ୍ୱ କରିଥିଲେ । ୧୮ ତାରିଖ ପୂର୍ବାହ୍ନର ଆଲୋଚନା ଶ୍ରୀ ନନ୍ଦକିଶୋର ଦାସ ଓ ସେଦିନର ଅପରାହ୍ନ ଆଲୋଚନା ଶ୍ରୀ ରତନ ଦାସ ଆରମ୍ଭ କରିଥିଲେ । ଉଭୟଦିନ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟକ୍ରମରେ ପ୍ରବନ୍ଧପାଠ ଓ ଆଲୋଚନା ସ୍ଥାନ ପାଇଥିଲା । ଏଠାରେ ବହୁ ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ, ଛାତ୍ର ଓ ସମାଜସେବୀ ଅଂଶ ଗ୍ରହଣ କରିଥିଲେ ।

ଡ: ବେଣୁଧର ପ୍ରଧାନ, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ହରିହର ଦାଶ, ଶ୍ରୀ ହରିହର ମିଶ୍ର, ଅଧ୍ୟାପିକା ଶାରଦା ରଥ, ଶ୍ରୀ ଶ୍ୟାମସୁନ୍ଦର ମିଶ୍ର, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ତ୍ରିଲୋଚନ ଶତପଥି, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ବିଷ୍ଣୁଚରଣ ରାଉତ, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ଭାସ୍କର ଚନ୍ଦ୍ର ଦାଶ ପ୍ରମୁଖ ଓ ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟର ସ୍ନାତକୋତ୍ତର ବିଭାଗ ଛାତ୍ରମାନଙ୍କ ମଧ୍ୟରୁ ସର୍ବଶ୍ରୀ ରଣଜିତ୍ କୁମାର ଦାସ, ଅଶୋକ ତ୍ରିପାଠି, ମନୋରଞ୍ଜନ ମିଶ୍ର ପ୍ରମୁଖ ପ୍ରବନ୍ଧ ପାଠ କରିଥିଲେ । ଆଲୋଚନାରେ ଯୋଗ ଦେଇ ଆଲୋଚନାକୁ ବଳିଷ୍ଠ କରିବାପାଇଁ ଉତ୍ସାହ ପ୍ରକାଶ ପାଇଥିଲା । ଡ: ବିଦ୍ୟାଧର ମିଶ୍ର, ଡ: ଗଣନାଥ ମିଶ୍ର, ଡ: ବୈଦ୍ୟନାଥ ମିଶ୍ର, ଡ: ମନ୍ମଥନାଥ ଦାସ, ଶ୍ରୀ ଶତ୍ରୁଘ୍ନ ନାଥ, ଶ୍ରୀ ଏ: ଭି: ସ୍ୱାମୀ, ଶ୍ରୀ ହରମୋହନ ପଟ୍ଟନାୟକ, ଶ୍ରୀ ପ୍ରଦୀପ୍ତ କିଶୋର ଦାସ, ଶ୍ରୀ ସୁଧାଂଶୁଶେଖର ଦାସ, ଶ୍ରୀ ହରିହର ପଣ୍ଡା, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ରବିନାରାୟଣ ଦାସ, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ବି: ଏନ୍ ପଟ୍ଟନାୟକ, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ ସତ୍ୟନାରାୟଣ ରଥ, ଶ୍ରୀ ବିଜୟାନନ୍ଦ କର, ଶ୍ରୀ ଅଶୋକ କୁମାର ମିଶ୍ର, ଶ୍ରୀ ପ୍ରଭାତ କୁମାର ମହାନ୍ତି, ଶ୍ରୀ ଅମରନାଥ ମିଶ୍ର, ଶ୍ରୀ ଧ୍ରୁବଚରଣ ସ୍ୱାଇଁ, ଶ୍ରୀ ପିତାମ୍ବର ପ୍ରଧାନ ପ୍ରମୁଖ ଆଲୋଚନାରେ ଭାଗ ନେଇଥିଲେ ।

ନିମ୍ନୋକ୍ତ କେତୋଟି ବିଷୟର ଆଲୋଚନାର ସାରମର୍ମରୂପେ ପ୍ରକାଶ ପାଇଥିଲା ।

୧—ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ରାଜନୀତିରେ ଆଧ୍ୟାତ୍ମିକତାର ପ୍ରୟୋଗ କରିଥିଲେ ।

୨—ଶୁଦ୍ଧ ସାଧନ ଜରିଆରେ ହିଁ ଶୁଦ୍ଧ ଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟରେ ପହଞ୍ଚିହେବ ।

୩—ଅହିଂସା ଓ ପ୍ରେମ ଆଧାରରେ ସମାଜବାଦୀ ଲୋକତନ୍ତ୍ର ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠା କରିବା ତାଙ୍କର ରାଜନୈତିକ ଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ ଥିଲା ।

୪—ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରର ବିଲୀନକରଣ ତାଙ୍କର ରାଜନୈତିକ ଆଦର୍ଶ ଥିଲା ।

୫—ତତ୍ତ୍ୱ ଓ ଆଚରଣ ମଧ୍ୟରେ ଐକ୍ୟ ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠା କରିବାକୁ ସେ ତାଙ୍କର ଜୀବନର ବ୍ରତ ବୋଲି ଗ୍ରହଣ କରିଥିଲେ ।

୬—କାର୍ଲ ମାର୍କସ ପରି ସେ ମଧ୍ୟ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିଗତ ମାଲିକାନାକୁ ଅସ୍ୱୀକାର କରିଥିଲେ । ତାଙ୍କର ଟ୍ରଷ୍ଟିସିପ୍ ତତ୍ତ୍ୱଦ୍ୱାରା ସେ ଗରିବମାନଙ୍କର ସମ୍ପତ୍ତି ଉପରେ ଅଧିକାରକୁ ସାବ୍ୟସ୍ତ କରିଥିଲେ ଏବଂ ଧନୀମାନଙ୍କୁ ସମାଜର ସମସ୍ତ ସମ୍ପତ୍ତିର ମାଲଫତ୍ତଦାର ବୋଲି ଅଭିହିତ କରିଥିଲେ ।

୭—ଅହିଂସକ ପନ୍ଥା ଜରିଆରେ ସମାଜରେ ସମ୍ପତ୍ତିର ପୁନର୍ବଣ୍ଟନ ଏବଂ ନିୟନ୍ତ୍ରଣ କରିବା ତାଙ୍କର ଧ୍ୟେୟ ଥିଲା ।

୮—କ୍ଷମତାର ସମ୍ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣ ବିକେନ୍ଦ୍ରୀକରଣଦ୍ୱାରା ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରକୁ କ୍ଷମତାହୀନ କରି ଲୋକଙ୍କ ହାତରେ ସମସ୍ତ କ୍ଷମତା ଦେବାକୁ ସେ ଚାହିଁଥିଲେ । ଦେଶବାସୀଙ୍କୁ ଆତ୍ମନିର୍ଭରଶୀଳ ଓ ସ୍ୱୟଂଶାସିତ ହେବାକୁ ସେ ପରାମର୍ଶ ଦେଉଥିଲେ ।

୯—ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିଗତ ସ୍ୱାତନ୍ତ୍ର୍ୟତାରେ ତାଙ୍କର ଆସ୍ଥା ଥିଲା । କାରଣ ଏହାଦ୍ୱାରା ହିଁ କେବଳ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିର ସର୍ବାଙ୍ଗୀନ ବିକାଶ ହେବ ବୋଲି ସେ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ କରୁଥିଲେ ।

୧୦—ରାଜନୀତି କ୍ଷେତ୍ରରେ ସେ ଆତ୍ମାର ବିଜ୍ଞାନର ପ୍ରୟୋଗ କରିଥିଲେ ।

୧୧—ଦେଶାତ୍ମବୋଧ ଓ ନୈତିକତା ବିହୀନ ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ସେ ଘୃଣା କରୁଥିଲେ ।

୧୨—ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ରାଜନୈତିକ କର୍ମୀ ତ୍ୟାଗ, ସହିଷ୍ଣୁତା ଓ ସେବାଭାବ ମାଧ୍ୟମରେ କେବଳ ରାଜନୈତିକ ଜୀବନ ଯାପନ କରିପାରିବେ ବୋଲି ସେ ଚାହୁଁଥିଲେ ।

୧୩—କ୍ଷମତା ଓ ଦଳୀୟ ରାଜନୀତି ପରିବର୍ତ୍ତେ ସେ ସେବାମୂଳକ ରାଜନୀତି ପ୍ରଚଳନ କରିବାକୁ ଚାହୁଁଥିଲେ ।

୧୪—ସେ ଭାରତକୁ ଏକ ଅଭିନବ ପନ୍ଥାରେ ପରାଧୀନତାରୁ ମୁକ୍ତ କରି ପୃଥିବୀର ସମସ୍ତ ପରାଧୀନ ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରଗୁଡ଼ିକର ମୁକ୍ତି ପାଇଁ ବାଟ ଖୋଲି ଦେଇଥିଲେ ଏବଂ ଏହାହିଁ ତାଙ୍କ ଜୀବନର ଶ୍ରେଷ୍ଠତମ ରାଜନୈତିକ ବିପ୍ଳବ ଥିଲା ।

୧୫—ଜନସାଧାରଣଙ୍କର ଶକ୍ତିର ସର୍ବାଙ୍ଗୀନ ବିକାଶ କରି ସେମାନଙ୍କୁ ଦେଶର ନୈତିକ ବିକାଶ ପାଇଁ ନିୟୋଜିତ କରିବାକୁ ସେ ଚାହୁଁଥିଲେ ।

୧୬—'ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ମଣିଷ ଭିତରେ ଭଲ ଗୁଣ ରହିଛି'—ଏହି ମୌଳିକ ତତ୍ତ୍ୱକୁ ସେ ରାଜନୈତିକ ସିଦ୍ଧାନ୍ତରୂପେ ଗ୍ରହଣ କରିଥିଲେ ।

ଆମର ଆଶା ଓ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ, ଏହି ପୁସ୍ତକଟି ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କ ରାଜନୈତିକ ବିଚାର ଧାରାକୁ ଚିନ୍ତନ ଓ ମନନ କରିବାରେ ସହାୟକ ହେବ । ଯେଉଁସବୁ ବନ୍ଧୁ, ଆଲୋଚକ, ଅଧ୍ୟାପକ, ଶିକ୍ଷାର୍ଥୀ ଓ ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟର ସର୍ମକର୍ତ୍ତାଙ୍କ ଅକ୍ଳାନ୍ତ ପରିଶ୍ରମ, ଅକୁଣ୍ଠିତ ସହଯୋଗ ଓ ପ୍ରେରଣା ଯୋଗୁଁ ଏହି ସମ୍ବଦଟି ସଫଳ ହେଲା ସେମାନଙ୍କୁ ଆମ୍ଭେମାନେ ଆନ୍ତରିକ କୃତଜ୍ଞତା ଜ୍ଞାପନ କରୁଅଛୁଁ ।

ଭୁବନେଶ୍ୱର
୨-୧୦-୭୯

ଶତ୍ରୁଘ୍ନ ନାଥ
ରତନ ଦାସ

ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀଙ୍କର ଦାନ

ଶ୍ରୀ ଶ୍ୟାମ ସୁନ୍ଦର ମିଶ୍ର, ସଭ୍ୟ, ହିନ୍ଦ୍ ସେବକ ସଂଘ,
କଟକ

[୧]

ମାନବ ସମାଜର ସୁଖ, ଦୁଃଖ, ଆନନ୍ଦ, ନିରାନନ୍ଦ, ପ୍ରଗତି, ଅଧୋଗତି ଏହା ସହିତ ତାହାର ରାଜନୀତି ଅଙ୍ଗାଙ୍ଗୀ ଭାବରେ ଜଡ଼ିତ । ଏହି ରାଜନୀତି ଇତିହାସର ବିଭିନ୍ନ ପର୍ଯ୍ୟାୟରେ ବିଭିନ୍ନ ଭାବରେ ଦେଖା ଦେଇଛି । ଏକ ସମୟରେ ଶାସ୍ତ୍ରକାର ମନୁ କହିଥିଲେ—

"ବାଲୋଽପି ନାବମନ୍ତବ୍ୟଃ ମନୁଷ୍ୟଇତି ଭୂମିପଃ,
ମହତୀ ଦେବତା ହ୍ୟେଷା ନର ରୂପେଣ ତିଷ୍ଠତି ।"

ସେହିପରି ୟୁରୋପରେ ପ୍ରଚଳିତ ହୋଇଥିଲା—"The Divine Right of Kings." ରାଜାର ସ୍ୱୈରାଚାର ଏକ ସମୟରେ ଦେଶର ଏକମାତ୍ର ରାଜନୀତି ଥିଲା କିନ୍ତୁ କାଳକ୍ରମେ ଅବସ୍ଥା ବଦଳି ଯାଇଛି । ବର୍ତ୍ତମାନ ସମଗ୍ର ପୃଥିବୀର ସଭ୍ୟଦେଶ ସବୁ ସ୍ୱୀକାର କଲେଣି ଯେ ରାଜନୀତିର ମୂଳଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ ହେଉଛି "The greatest good of the greatest number" ଅର୍ଥାତ୍ ବହୁ ସଂଖ୍ୟକ ଲୋକଙ୍କର ସର୍ବାଧିକ କଲ୍ୟାଣ । ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ସମାଜର ସମୃଦ୍ଧି ଉନ୍ନତି ରାଜନୀତିର ମୂଳଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ ହେବା ଉଚିତ । ଏହା ସ୍ୱୀକୃତ ହୋଇଥିଲେ ହେଁ ସ୍ୱାର୍ଥପରତା ମନୁଷ୍ୟକୁ ସହଜରେ ଛାଡ଼େ ନାହିଁ । ଯେଉଁମାନେ ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକାରେ ମୁଷ୍ଟିମେୟ ଗୋରାଲୋକଙ୍କର ବର୍ଣ୍ଣବୈଷମ୍ୟ ନୀତି ଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ

କରୁଛନ୍ତି, ଯୁକ୍ତରାଷ୍ଟ୍ର ଆମେରିକା ଭଳି ସଭ୍ୟ ଗଣତନ୍ତ୍ରରେ ନିଗ୍ରୋମାନଙ୍କର ନିର୍ଯାତନା ଆଖି ଆଗରେ ଦେଖୁଛନ୍ତି ଏବଂ ଆମ ଜନ୍ମଭୂମି ଭାରତବର୍ଷରେ ତଥାକଥିତ ଅସ୍ପୃଶ୍ୟମାନଙ୍କପ୍ରତି ସବର୍ଣ୍ଣ ହିନ୍ଦୁମାନଙ୍କର ଅତ୍ୟାଚାର ସ୍ମରଣ କରୁଛନ୍ତି ସେମାନେ ଭାବିବା ସ୍ୱାଭାବିକ ଯେ ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ଜାତିର କଲ୍ୟାଣ ରାଜନୀତିର ଘୋଷିତ ଉଦ୍ଦେଶ୍ୟ ହେଲେହେଁ, ଏହା କାର୍ଯ୍ୟକାରୀ କରାଯିବା ବହୁ ସମୟ ସାପେକ୍ଷ । ମହାତ୍ମା ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଥିଲେ ଏପରି ରାଜନୀତିଜ୍ଞ ଯେଉଁ ସମସ୍ତ ଆନ୍ତରିକତାର ସହିତ ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ସମାଜର କଲ୍ୟାଣ କାମନା କରୁଥିଲେ । ସେ ଯେତେବେଳେ ସତୁରିବର୍ଷ ବୟସରେ ପଦାର୍ପଣ କଲେ, ସେତେବେଳେ ତାଙ୍କ ଉଦ୍ଦେଶ୍ୟରେ ଯେଉଁ ଅଭିନନ୍ଦନ ଗ୍ରନ୍ଥ ଡକ୍ଟର ରାଧାକୃଷ୍ଣନଙ୍କ ସମ୍ପାଦକତ୍ୱରେ ପ୍ରକାଶିତ ହୋଇଥିଲା ସେଥିରେ ଡକ୍ଟର ରାଧାକୃଷ୍ଣନ୍ ତାଙ୍କ ସମ୍ବନ୍ଧରେ ଲେଖିଛନ୍ତି:—"He stood out for the essential principle that men qua men are equal and artificial distinctions based on race and colour were both unreasonable and immoral. (Mahatma Gandhi, Essays and Reflections—Page 19) ଅର୍ଥାତ୍ ମାନବ ମାତ୍ରେ ସମାନ, ଏହା ଥିଲା ମହାତ୍ମାଙ୍କ ମତରେ ସାରକଥା । ସେ ଅପ୍ରାକୃତ ସମସ୍ତ ରକମ ବୈଷମ୍ୟକୁ ଅଯଥାର୍ଥ ଓ ଦୁର୍ନୀତିଗ୍ରସ୍ତ ବୋଲି ମନେ କରୁଥିଲେ । ତାଙ୍କର ନିଜ ଭାଷାରେ କହିବାକୁ ଗଲେ :—I went to identify myself with everything that lives. In the language of the Gita I want to live at peace with both friend and foe. So my patriotism is for me a stage on my journey to the land of eternal freedom and peace (C.F.Andrews Mahatma Gandhi—His own Story PP. 353-4,357) ସୁତରାଂ ଯେଉଁଠାରେ ଚିରନ୍ତନ ସ୍ୱାଧୀନତା ଏବଂ ଶାନ୍ତି ବିରାଜମାନ ସେହିଠାରେ ପ୍ରବେଶ କରିବା ମହାତ୍ମାଙ୍କର ଧ୍ୟେୟ ଥିଲା । ଏଥିରୁ ସହଜରେ ବୁଝି ହେବ ଯେ ସେ କ୍ଷମତା ରାଜନୀତିର ଉପାସକ ନ ଥିଲେ । ତାଙ୍କ ମତରେ ରାଜନୀତି

ଥିଲା ଧର୍ମର ଏକ ଅଙ୍ଗ । ସେ ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ସମାଜର କଲ୍ୟାଣ ଦୃଷ୍ଟିରୁ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ବିଷୟର ଆଲୋଚନା କରୁଥିଲେ । ତାଙ୍କ ଭାଷାରେ କହିବାକୁ ଗଲେ :—I recognise no God except God that is to be found in the hearts of dumb millions. They do not recognise His presence; I do. And I worship God that is Truth or Truth which is God, through the service of these millions.' (Harijan-March 11, 1939) ଯେଉଁଠାରେ ସେ ଏହି କଲ୍ୟାଣର ବ୍ୟତ୍ୟୟ ଦେଖୁଥିଲେ ସେଠାରେ ସେ ନିଜର ସମସ୍ତ ନିଷ୍ଠା ଓ ଆନ୍ତରିକତା ସହ ତାହା ବିରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ଠିଆ ହେଉଥିଲେ । ଅହିଂସ ଉପାୟରେ ସମସ୍ତ ସମସ୍ୟାର ସମାଧାନ କରିବା ତାଙ୍କ ଜୀବନର ମୂଳ ଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ ଥିଲା କାରଣ କୌଣସି ବ୍ୟକ୍ତି-ବିଶେଷ ବା ପ୍ରାଣୀ ପ୍ରତି କେବେହେଲେ ତାଙ୍କର ବିରାଗ ବା ବିରୋଧ ନ ଥିଲା । ସେ ଦୁର୍ନୀତି ଗ୍ରସ୍ତ ବ୍ୟବସ୍ଥା ବା ପରିସ୍ଥିତିର ବିରୋଧ କରୁଥିଲେ । କିନ୍ତୁ ଏହା କଲାବେଳେ ମଧ୍ୟ କୌଣସି ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିବିଶେଷଙ୍କ ପ୍ରତି ତାଙ୍କର ଆକ୍ରୋଶ ନ ଥିଲା । ୧୯୩୦ ମସିହାରେ ଭାରତର ତତ୍କାଳୀନ ବଡ଼ଲାଟ ଲର୍ଡ଼ ଇରୱିନ୍‌ଙ୍କଠାକୁ ସେ ଲେଖିଥିଲେ :—My personal faith is absolutely clear. I cannot intentionally hurt anything that lives.' ଏଥିରୁ ସ୍ପଷ୍ଟ ପ୍ରମାଣିତ ହେବ ଯେ ମହାତ୍ମାଗାନ୍ଧୀ ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ମାନବ ସମାଜର ତୁଚ୍ଛ ଈର୍ଷା, ଦ୍ୱେଷ, ବାଦ, ବିବାଦର ବହୁ ଉର୍ଦ୍ଧ୍ୱକୁ ନେଇ ତାହାକୁ ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ଜାତିର ମଙ୍ଗଳ ଲାଗି ବ୍ୟବହାର କରିଥିଲେ । ଏହାହିଁ ଥିଲା ରାଜନୀତି ପ୍ରତି ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀଙ୍କର ବିପୁଳ ଦାନ । ସେ ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ଆଧ୍ୟାତ୍ମିକ ଭିତ୍ତି ଉପରେ ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠିତ କରିଥିଲେ ଏବଂ ଅହିଂସା ମାଧ୍ୟମରେ ସମସ୍ତ ସମସ୍ୟାର ସମାଧାନ ତାଙ୍କ ରାଜନୀତିର ମୂଳମନ୍ତ୍ର ଥିଲା । ନିଜର ତ୍ୟାଗ, ନିଷ୍ଠା, ଓ କୃଚ୍ଛ୍ର ସାଧନା ମାଧ୍ୟମରେ ଶତ୍ରୁର ହୃଦୟ ଜୟ କରିବା ତାଙ୍କର ମୂଳନୀତି ଥିଲା । ଫଳରେ ଏହା ହେଲା ଯେ ଯଦି ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକାରେ ଜେନେରେଲ ସ୍ମଟ୍‌ସ ସରକାର ବିରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ଲଢୁଥିଲେ ମଧ୍ୟ, ନିଜେ ଜେନେରେଲ ସ୍ମଟସ୍ ତାଙ୍କର ଜଣେ ବିଶିଷ୍ଟ ବନ୍ଧୁ

ଏବଂ ପ୍ରଶଂସକ ହୋଇପାରିଥିଲେ । ସେହିପରି ସେ ବ୍ରିଟିଶ ସାମ୍ରାଜ୍ୟବାଦର ଧ୍ୱଂସ ସାଧନ ଲାଗି ବଦ୍ଧପରିକର ଥିଲେ ହେଁ ବହୁ ବିଲାତବାସୀ ତାଙ୍କର ଭକ୍ତ ଓ ସମର୍ଥକ ଥିଲେ ଏବଂ ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ସମାଜର ଚିନ୍ତା ଧାରା ପ୍ରତି ତାଙ୍କର ଯେ ବିପୁଳ ଦାନ ରହିଛି ଏହା ମୁକ୍ତ କଣ୍ଠରେ ସ୍ୱୀକାର କରୁଥିଲେ । ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ମନେ କରୁଥିଲେ ଯେ ଲୋକ ଯଦି ସାଧୁ ଏବଂ ସଚ୍ଚରିତ୍ର ହୁଏ ତାହାହେଲେ ସେ ଏକା ହେଲେ ମଧ୍ୟ ଅତି କଠିନ ଉଦ୍ଦେଶ୍ୟ ସାଧନ କରିପାରେ । ତାଙ୍କ ମତରେ କୌଣସି ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ସେ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନର ଅନୁଚରମାନଙ୍କ ସଂଖ୍ୟା ଉପରେ ଯେତେ ନିର୍ଭର ନ କରେ, ସେତେ ନିର୍ଭର କରେ ସେମାନଙ୍କର ତ୍ୟାଗ, ଚରିତ୍ରବଳ ଓ ସାଧୁତା ଉପରେ । ତେଣୁ ଆମ ଦେଶରେ ବ୍ରିଟିଶ ସରକାର ବିରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ସେ ଯେତେବେଳେ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିଗତ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହର ପ୍ରବର୍ତ୍ତନ କଲେ, ସେତେବେଳେ ନିଷ୍ଠା ଏବଂ ସାଧୁତା ଦୃଷ୍ଟିରୁ ସେ ବିନୋବା ଭାବେଙ୍କୁ ପ୍ରଥମ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହୀ ରୂପେ ବାଛି ଥିଲେ । ନିଜ ଜୀବନ ଏବଂ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟାବଳୀ ଦ୍ୱାରା ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ପ୍ରମାଣିତ କରିଛନ୍ତି ଯେ ଜଣେ ଲୋକ ଅଦମ୍ୟ ଉଦ୍ୟମ ଏବଂ ଏକାନ୍ତ ନିଷ୍ଠା ବଳରେ ସମଗ୍ର ପୃଥିବୀର ମାନବ-ସମାଜକୁ କେତେଦୂର ପ୍ରଭାବିତ କରିପାରେ । ତାଙ୍କର ଜୀବନୀ ଲେଖକ ଲୁଇଫିସର ତାଙ୍କ ସମ୍ବନ୍ଧରେ ଲେଖିଛନ୍ତି :—Millions obeyed Gandhi, myriads adored him, multitudes accounted themselves his followers, only a handful did as he did. He knew it. The knowledge did not diminish his volcanic energy or break his steel will.' (The life of Mahatma Gandhi-Louis Fischer, Part II, Page-118.)

ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ମାନବର ବୈଶିଷ୍ଟ୍ୟ ଓ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିତ୍ୱର ବିକାଶ ଲାଗି ମହାତ୍ମା ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଏତେଦୂର ଆଗ୍ରହୀ ଥିଲେ ଯେ ସେ ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ର ହାତରେ ସର୍ବନିମ୍ନ କ୍ଷମତା ଦେବାପାଇଁ ଇଚ୍ଛୁକ ଥିଲେ । ସେ ମନୁଷ୍ୟ ମେସିନ ବ୍ୟବହାର କରିବାର ବିରୋଧୀ ନ ଥିଲେ । କିନ୍ତୁ ବଡ଼ ବଡ଼ ଶିଳ୍ପ ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠାନରେ ମନୁଷ୍ୟ ଯେପରି ମେସିନ ଭଳି କାମ କରୁଥିଲା ଏବଂ ଜିନିଷ ତିଆରି କରିବାରେ ସହାୟକ

ହେବା ବ୍ୟତୀତ ତାହାର ଯେ ଅନ୍ୟ ସତ୍ତା ନ ଥିଲା. ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ଏହାର ଘୋର ବିରୋଧୀ ଥିଲେ । ମାନବର ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣ ସ୍ୱାଧୀନତା ଏବଂ ବିକାଶ ତାଙ୍କର ଧ୍ୟେୟ ଥିବା ହେତୁ ସେ ବିକେନ୍ଦ୍ରିତ ଶାସନ ତଥା ଶିଳ୍ପରେ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ କରୁଥିଲେ । ସେ ଚାହୁଁ ଥିଲେ ଯେ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ଗ୍ରାମ ସ୍ୱାବଲମ୍ବୀ ହୋଇ ଏକ ଗ୍ରାମରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରରେ ପରିଣତ ହେଉ । ଲୋକେ ଅନ୍ୟ ଉପରେ ବା ଅନ୍ୟ ଦେଶ ଉପରେ ନିର୍ଭର ନ କରି ସେମାନଙ୍କର ଜୀବନଯାତ୍ରା ନିର୍ବାହ କରନ୍ତୁ । ଏହାର ଅର୍ଥ ଏହା ନ ଥିଲା ଯେ ସେ ଆନ୍ତର୍ଜାତୀୟ ବ୍ୟବସାୟ ବା ସମ୍ପର୍କ ପସନ୍ଦ କରୁ ନ ଥିଲେ । ସମଗ୍ର ବିଶ୍ୱର ମାନବ ସମାଜ ଯେ ପରସ୍ପରର ବନ୍ଧୁ, ଏହା ତାଙ୍କ ଜୀବନର ମୂଳ ଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ ଥିଲା । ତଥାପି ସେ ଚାହୁଁ ଥିଲେ ଯେ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ଲୋକ ଯେତେଦୂର ସମ୍ଭବ ସ୍ୱାବଲମ୍ବୀ ହେବା ଉଚିତ । ତାହାହେଲେ କେହି କାହାର ଗଳଗ୍ରହ ହେବ ନାହିଁ ବା କେହି କାହାକୁ ଶୋଷଣ କରିବାକୁ ଅବକାଶ ପାଇବ ନାହିଁ । ବିଶାଳ ଶିଳ୍ପର ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠା ଯେ ବିଶାଳ ବିକାର ଚାହେଁ, ଏଥିରେ ସନ୍ଦେହର ଅବକାଶ ନାହିଁ । ଯେଉଁ ଯେଉଁ ଦେଶରେ ବଡ଼ ବଡ଼ ଶିଳ୍ପ ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠିତ ହୋଇଛି, ସେହି ସେହି ଦେଶ ସବୁ ଶିଳ୍ପ ଦିଗରେ ଅନୁନ୍ନତ ଦେଶଗୁଡ଼ିକରେ ତାଙ୍କର ତିଆରି ଜିନିଷ ବିକ୍ରୀ କରିବା ଲାଗି ସେମାନଙ୍କ ଉପରେ ରାଜନୀତିକ ତଥା ଆର୍ଥନୀତିକ ପ୍ରଭାବ ପକାଉଛନ୍ତି । ଏହି ଉପାୟରେହିଁ ଦଳେ ଲୋକ ଅନ୍ୟ ଦଳେ ଲୋକଙ୍କୁ ଶୋଷଣ କରନ୍ତି । କହିବା ବାହୁଲ୍ୟ ଯେ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ଏହି ବ୍ୟବସ୍ଥାର ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣ ବିରୋଧୀ ଥିଲେ । ଆଗରୁ କୁହାଯାଇଛି ଯେ ସେ ଚାହୁଁ ଥିଲେ ସବୁ ଦେଶର ମଣିଷ ଯେପରି ସମାନ ହେବେ । ତେଣୁ ସେ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିର ଉନ୍ନତି ଏବଂ ବିକାଶ ଉପରେହିଁ ସମସ୍ତ ଜୋର ଦେଉଥିଲେ । ସେ ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରର ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠା ଚାହୁଁ ଥିଲେ, କିନ୍ତୁ ତାଙ୍କ ମତରେ ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରର ଲକ୍ଷ୍ୟ ହେବା ଉଚିତ—ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରବାସୀ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିର ଉନ୍ନତି ଏବଂ ବିକାଶ । ମାନବ ସମାଜର କଲ୍ୟାଣ ସାଧନ ଲାଗି ରାଷ୍ଟ୍ରକୁ ସେ ଏକ ଆୟୁଧ ରୂପେ ବ୍ୟବହାର କରିବାକୁ ଚାହୁଁ ଥିଲେ । ତେଣୁ ସେ ଶାସନ ଏବଂ ଶିଳ୍ପ କ୍ଷେତ୍ରରେ ବିକେନ୍ଦ୍ରୀ-କରଣରେ ପକ୍ଷପାତୀ ଥିଲେ ଏବଂ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ଗ୍ରାମକୁ ଏକ ସାଧାରଣତନ୍ତ୍ରରେ (Republic) ପରିଣତ କରିବାକୁ ଚାହୁଁ ଥିଲେ ।

ଆଗରୁ କୁହାଯାଇଛି ଯେ ମାନବର ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିତ୍ୱପ୍ରତି ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀଙ୍କର ଯଥେଷ୍ଟ ସମ୍ମାନ ଥିଲା । ମନୁଷ୍ୟ ଭିତରେ ସେ ବଡ଼ସାନ ପ୍ରଭେଦ ମାନୁ ନ ଥିଲେ । ତେଣୁ ତାଙ୍କ କଳ୍ପିତ ଗଣତନ୍ତ୍ରରେ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ଲୋକର ସମାନ ଅଧିକାର ରହିବା ସେ ପସନ୍ଦ କରୁଥିଲେ । ପୃଥିବୀର ବହୁରାଜ୍ୟ ନିଜକୁ ଗଣତନ୍ତ୍ର ବୋଲି ଘୋଷଣା କରୁଛନ୍ତି । କିନ୍ତୁ ସେମାନଙ୍କ ମଧ୍ୟରୁ ସବୁ ରାଜ୍ୟରେ ଯେ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ମାନବର ସମାନ ଅଧିକାର ନାହିଁ, ଏହା ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକା ତଥା ରୋଡ଼େସିଆ ପ୍ରଭୃତି ଦେଶର ଶାସନ ପ୍ରଣାଳୀ ଦେଖିଲେ ସ୍ପଷ୍ଟ ଜଣାଯିବ । ଶାସନର ପରିଚାଳନାରେ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ଶାସନସ୍ଥିତ ସମସ୍ତ ଲୋକଙ୍କର ସମାନ ଅଧିକାର ଚାହୁଁଥିଲେ । କିନ୍ତୁ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟକ୍ଷ ନିର୍ବାଚନ ପ୍ରଣାଳୀରେ ବଡ଼ ବଡ଼ ନିର୍ବାଚନ ମଣ୍ଡଳୀ ଗଠନ କରିବା ଅପେକ୍ଷା ସେ ନିର୍ବାଚନ ମଣ୍ଡଳୀକୁ କ୍ଷୁଦ୍ର କରି ତା'ର ମାଧ୍ୟମରେ ପରୋକ୍ଷ ନିର୍ବାଚନର ପ୍ରଚଳନ ଚାହୁଁଥିଲେ । ଯେଉଁ ଧାରାରେ 'ନିଖିଳ ଭାରତ କଂଗ୍ରେସ କମିଟି' ଗଠିତ ହେଉଅଛି, ସେହି ଧାରାରେ ସେ କେନ୍ଦ୍ର ସରକାର ତଥା ରାଜ୍ୟ ସରକାର ମାନଙ୍କର ବିଧାନସଭା ଗଠନ କରିବାକୁ ଚାହୁଁଥିଲେ । ଦ୍ୱିତୀୟ ଗୋଲଟେବୁଲ ବୈଠକରେ ଯୋଗଦେଇ ସେ ଏହି ଭଳି ନିର୍ବାଚନପ୍ରଣାଳୀର ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣ ସମର୍ଥନ ଜଣାଇ ଥିଲେ । କିନ୍ତୁ ଭାରତୀୟ ସମ୍ବିଧାନରେ କେନ୍ଦ୍ର ତଥା ରାଜ୍ୟ ସରକାରଙ୍କର ବିଧାନସଭା ଲାଗି ପ୍ରତ୍ୟକ୍ଷ ନିର୍ବାଚନହିଁ କାଏମ ରହିଲା । କେବଳ କେନ୍ଦ୍ରୀୟ ରାଜ୍ୟସଭା ତଥା ରାଜ୍ୟ ବିଧାନ ପରିଷଦରେ (Legislative Council) ପରୋକ୍ଷ ନିର୍ବାଚନ ପ୍ରବର୍ତ୍ତିତ ହେଲା । ତେଣୁ ଏହା କହିବା ଅସଙ୍ଗତ ହେବ ନାହିଁ ଯେ ମହାତ୍ମାଗାନ୍ଧୀ ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣ ଏବଂ ଅନାବିଳ ଗଣତନ୍ତ୍ର ଶାସନର ପକ୍ଷପାତୀ ଥିଲେ ।

ମୋଟ ଉପରେ କହିବାକୁ ଗଲେ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀଙ୍କର ବିରାଟ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିତ୍ୱର ପ୍ରଭାବରେ ହିଁ ଭାରତୀୟ ରାଜନୀତି ମୁଷ୍ଟିମେୟ ଶିକ୍ଷିତ ଲୋକଙ୍କ ଭିତରେ ସୀମାବଦ୍ଧ ନ ରହି ଦେଶର ଆବାଳବୃଦ୍ଧବନିତାଙ୍କ ପ୍ରାଣକୁ ସ୍ପର୍ଶ କରିପାରିଥିଲା । ରାଜନୀତିରେ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀଙ୍କର ଆବିର୍ଭାବ ପୂର୍ବରୁ ଲାଲା ଲଜପତ୍ ରାୟ, ବାଲ ଗଙ୍ଗାଧର ତିଲକ, ବିପିନଚନ୍ଦ୍ର ପାଲ ପ୍ରଭୃତି ବହୁ ବିଶିଷ୍ଟ ଜନସେବୀ ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ଦେଶର ଜନସାଧାରଣଙ୍କ ନିକଟରେ ପରିଚିତ ଏବଂ ଆଦୃତ

କରିବାର ଉଦ୍ୟମ କରିଥିଲେ । ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ଏହି ଉଦ୍ୟମରେ ମୁକ୍ତି ମାରିଥିଲେ ।

କେବଳ ସେତିକି ନୁହେଁ, ସେ ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ଏକ ଉଚ୍ଚ ସ୍ତରକୁ ଉନ୍ନୀତ କରି ତାହାକୁ ସମଗ୍ର ମାନବ ସମାଜର କଲ୍ୟାଣ ଲାଗି ବ୍ୟବହାର କରିଥିଲେ । ରାଜନୀତି ଯେ ଧର୍ମର ଏକ ଅଙ୍ଗ ବିଶେଷ ଏହା ତାଙ୍କର କାର୍ଯ୍ୟାବଳୀରେ ସେ ପ୍ରମାଣିତ କରିଥିଲେ । ତାଙ୍କର ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନରେ ଅନ୍ୟାୟ, ଅତ୍ୟାଚାରର ପ୍ରବଳ ବିରୋଧ କରାଯାଉଥିଲା । କିନ୍ତୁ ସେଥିରେ ଈର୍ଷା ବା ଦ୍ୱେଷର ସ୍ଥାନ ମଧ୍ୟ ନ ଥିଲା । ଏଣୁ ଯେଉଁମାନଙ୍କ ବିରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ଏହି ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ହେଉଥିଲା, ସେମାନଙ୍କ ଭିତରୁ ଅନେକେ ଏହି ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନରେ ସାରବସ୍ତୁ ଉପଲବ୍‌ଧି କରୁଥିଲେ । ଭାରତର ସ୍ୱାଧୀନତା ପାଇଁ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀ ତାଙ୍କର ସମସ୍ତ ଜୀବନ ବ୍ୟୟ କରିଥିଲେ ହେଁ, ତାଙ୍କ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନର ପ୍ରଭାବ କେବଳ ଭାରତ ଭିତରେ ସୀମାବଦ୍ଧ ନ ଥିଲା । ଏହା ସାରା ବିଶ୍ୱର ଚିନ୍ତାଧାରା ଏବଂ କର୍ମ ପଦ୍ଧତିକୁ ପ୍ରବଳ ଭାବରେ ପ୍ରଭାବିତ କରିଥିଲା ।

ରାଜନୀତିକୁ ମହାତ୍ମାଜୀଙ୍କ ଦାନ

ଶ୍ରୀ ହରିହର ମିଶ୍ର

[୨]

ମହାତ୍ମା ଗାନ୍ଧୀଙ୍କ ହରିଜନ ରାଜନୀତିର ଉପାଦାନ ଓ ଧାରା ଉଭୟର ବିଶ୍ଲେଷଣ କଲେ ସ୍ପଷ୍ଟ ଦେଖାଯାଏ ଯେ ସେ ରାଜନୀତିର ପରମ୍ପରା ଭାଙ୍ଗି ଦେଇଥିଲେ । ପୂର୍ବରୁ ଧାରଣା ଥିଲା ଯେ ରାଜନୀତିକ ସମାଜ ମୁଖ୍ୟତଃ ଅନୈତିକ ଏବଂ ଗୋଟିଏ ସତ୍‌କାର୍ଯ୍ୟକୁ ସଫଳ କରିବାପାଇଁ ସତ୍‌ପନ୍ଥା ଅବଲମ୍ବନ କରିବା ବାଧ୍ୟତାମୂଳକ ନୁହେଁ । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଦୃଢ଼ ଭାବରେ ଏହି ରାଜନୀତିକ ତତ୍ତ୍ୱ ବା ଧାରଣାର ପ୍ରତିରୋଧ କରୁଥିଲେ । ରାଜନୀତିକ ଚିନ୍ତାଧାରାରେ ଏହି ବୈପ୍ଳବିକ ପରିବର୍ତ୍ତନ ଆଣିବା ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ବୈଶିଷ୍ଟ୍ୟ ଓ ତାଙ୍କ କର୍ମପନ୍ଥାର ମହତ୍ତ୍ୱ । ରାଜନୀତିକ ଉଦ୍ଦେଶ୍ୟ ସାଧନପାଇଁ ସେ ଯେଉଁ କୌଶଳ ପ୍ରୟୋଗ କରୁଥିଲେ ତାହା ନମ୍ରତା ଓ ସତର୍କତାର ସମନ୍ୱୟ ଓ ସ୍ୱେଚ୍ଛାଚାରଦୁଷ୍ଟ କ୍ଷମତାର ପ୍ରତିରୋଧ ସହିତ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିଗତ ଭଦ୍ରାଚରଣ ଓ ବନ୍ଧୁଭାବର ସମାବେଶ ଦ୍ୱାରା ରଚିତ ହୋଇଥିଲା । ସେ ନିଜେ ନେତୃତ୍ୱର କ୍ଷମତାକୁ ତୁଚ୍ଛ ମଣୁଥିଲେ । ତେଣୁ ସହଯୋଗମୂଳକ କର୍ମ-ପନ୍ଥାରେ ଗୋଷ୍ଠୀର ମତାମତକୁ ସ୍ୱୀକାର କରିବାରେ ଦ୍ୱିଧା କରୁନଥିଲେ ବା ନିଜେ ପ୍ରୟୋଗ କରିଥିବା ଉପାୟକୁ ବର୍ଜନ କରିବାରେ ପଶ୍ଚାତ୍‌ପଦ ହେଉ ନ ଥିଲେ । ସେ ୧୯୨୨ ଖ୍ରୀଷ୍ଟାବ୍ଦରେ ଆଇନଅମାନ୍ୟ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ଆରମ୍ଭ କରିଥିଲେ । ମାତ୍ର ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣମାତ୍ରାରେ ଚାଲୁ ହେବା ପୂର୍ବରୁ, ଉତ୍ତର ପ୍ରଦେଶର ଗୋରଖପୁର ଜିଲ୍ଲାର ଚୌରିଚୌରାଠାରେ ଜନତାର

ହିଂସାକାଣ୍ଡର ସମ୍ବାଦ ପାଇ ସେ ତୁରନ୍ତ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ବନ୍ଦ କରି ଦେଇଥିଲେ । ଏଥିରେ ତାଙ୍କର ସହକର୍ମୀଗଣ ଅତ୍ୟନ୍ତ ଉତ୍ତେଜିତ ହୋଇଥିଲେ ମାତ୍ର ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ସେମାନଙ୍କର ସମାଲୋଚନା ବା କଟୂକ୍ତି ବା ଅପ୍ରୀତିକରଣ ଦ୍ୱାରା ଭୀତ ହୋଇନଥିଲେ । ସେ କହିଥିଲେ ଯେ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟପନ୍ଥାର ବିପର୍ଯ୍ୟସ୍ତ ରାଜନୀତିକ ଦୃଷ୍ଟିକୋଣରୁ ଅସମୀଚୀନ ଓ ଅଙ୍କତାପୁଷ୍ଟ ହୋଇପାରେ ମାତ୍ର ଧର୍ମଦୃଷ୍ଟିରୁ ଏହା ନଭୁଲ୍ ।

ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କ ଦୃଷ୍ଟିରେ ଧର୍ମର ଅର୍ଥ ନୈତିକ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ । ସେ କେବେହେଁ ତାଙ୍କର ରାଜନୀତିକ କର୍ମସଂସ୍ଥାନକୁ ନୈତିକବିଶ୍ୱାସର ପରିସର ବାହାରେ ଅନ୍ୟକୌଣସି ଭାବରେ ଦେଖି ନଥିଲେ । ଯେ କୌଣସି ପ୍ରକାରର ହିଂସାତ୍ମକ କାଣ୍ଡ ବା ପ୍ରବୃତ୍ତି, ନୈତିକ ବିଶ୍ୱାସର ବିରୋଧୀ । ତେଣୁ ରାଜନୀତିକ ଦ୍ୱନ୍ଦ୍ୱ ବା ବିପ୍ଳବ ପ୍ରଚେଷ୍ଟାରେ ସେ କୌଣସି ପ୍ରକାରର ହିଂସାତ୍ମକ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟକୁ ପ୍ରଶ୍ରୟ ଦେଉନଥିଲେ । ୧୯୨୮ ଖ୍ରୀଷ୍ଟାବ୍ଦରେ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ବର୍ଦ୍ଦୋଲିରେ ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣିଅରେ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ଆରମ୍ଭ କଲେ ଏବଂ ଏହି ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣରୂପେ ଅହିଂସ ଭାବରେ ପରିଚାଳିତ ହୋଇଥିଲା । ସେ ଅନ୍ୟତ୍ର ସହାନୁଭୂତି ସୂଚକ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ କରାଇ ଦେଇନଥିଲେ । ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ଫଳରେ ସରକାର ଲୋକମାନଙ୍କର ଦାବୀ ସ୍ୱୀକାର କରିଥିଲେ ।

ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କ ଦୃଷ୍ଟିରେ, ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହ ବା ଆଇନ ଅମାନ୍ୟ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ କେବଳ ଗୋଟିଏ ରାଜନୀତିକ କୌଶଳର ପ୍ରୟୋଗ ନୁହେଁ ଅଥବା ତିକ୍ତତା, କ୍ରୋଧ, ବୈଫଲ୍ୟ, ନିର୍ଯ୍ୟାତନା ବା ବୈରଭାବରୁ ଜାତ ସାମୟିକ ଉତ୍ତେଜନା ଚାଳିତ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟପନ୍ଥା ନୁହେଁ । ଏହା ଜୀବନ ଧାରଣର ଏକ ଭଙ୍ଗୀ, ଏକ ପ୍ରଣାଳୀ । ଲବଣ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହ ଅଭିଯାନର ଆରମ୍ଭ ଦିବସ ୧୯୩୦ ମସିହା ମାର୍ଚ୍ଚ ୧୨ତାରିଖଠାରୁ ଦାଣ୍ଡୀ ପହଞ୍ଚିବା ଦିବସ ଅପ୍ରେଲ ୬ ତାରିଖ ପର୍ଯ୍ୟନ୍ତ, ଯାତ୍ରାପଥରେ ପ୍ରତ୍ୟେକ ଦିନ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଲୋକମାନଙ୍କୁ ଖଦୀ ପିନ୍ଧିବାକୁ, ବାଲ୍ୟବିବାହ ପ୍ରଥା ବନ୍ଦ କରିବାକୁ, ନିର୍ମଳ ଜୀବନ ଯାପନ କରିବାକୁ ଅସ୍ପୃଶ୍ୟତା ବର୍ଜନ କରିବାକୁ ନିଶାଦ୍ରବ୍ୟର ବ୍ୟବହାର ତ୍ୟାଗ କରିବାକୁ, ନିବେଦନ କରୁଥିଲେ ଓ ପ୍ରବର୍ତ୍ତାଉ ଥିଲେ ଏବଂ ଏହିପରି ଭାବରେ ଦିନ

କାଟିବା ପରେ କେବଳ ଯେତେବେଳେ ଡାକ ଆସିବ, ସେତେବେଳେ ଆଇନ ଅମାନ୍ୟ କରିବାକୁ ପ୍ରସ୍ତୁତ ରହିବାକୁ ବୁଝାଉଥିଲେ ।

ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ, ରାଜନୀତିକ ଅସ୍ତ୍ର ଭାବରେ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହର ବ୍ୟବହାର ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକାରେ ଆରମ୍ଭ କରିଥିଲେ ଓ ଏହାକୁ ଦୁଇଥର ପ୍ରୟୋଗ କରିଥିଲେ । ଥରେ ୧୯୦୭ ମସିହାରେ ଓ ପୁଣିଥରେ ୧୯୧୩ ମସିହାରେ । ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହ ସେହି ସମୟରୁ ଅହିଂସ ପ୍ରତିରୋଧ ଅର୍ଥରେ ବୁଝାଯାଉଛି । ୧୯୧୩ ମସିହାରେ ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକାରେ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଯେବେ, ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକା ସରକାର ଭାରତୀୟ ଶ୍ରମିକମାନଙ୍କ ଉପରେ ବସିଥିବା ବାର୍ଷିକ କର ଉଠାଇ ଦେବା ପ୍ରତିଶ୍ରୁତି ରକ୍ଷା ନକରିବା ଯୋଗୁଁ, ୨୫୦୦ ଶ୍ରମିକଙ୍କର ନେତୃତ୍ୱ ନେଇ ସରକାରଙ୍କର ଉଦାସୀନତା ବିରୋଧ କରି ନେଟାଲରୁ ଟ୍ରାନ୍ସଭାଲକୁ ଯାତ୍ରା କଲେ ଓ ତାଙ୍କର ଏହି ଅପୂର୍ବ କୌଶଳ ଉଦ୍ଦେଶ୍ୟ ସାଧନରେ ସାଫଲ୍ୟ ଆଣିଲା, ସେବଠାରୁ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ସୁନାମ ଭାରତର ସର୍ବପ୍ରାନ୍ତରେ ବ୍ୟାପ୍ତ ହୋଇଥିଲା । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଭାରତରେ ସର୍ବପ୍ରଥମେ ଏହି କୌଶଳର ପ୍ରୟୋଗ ୧୯୧୭ ମସିହାରେ ବିହାରର ନୀଳଚାଷରେ ନିଯୁକ୍ତ ଅତ୍ୟାଚାରିତ ବର୍ଗଚାଷୀ ଶ୍ରମିକମାନଙ୍କ ସପକ୍ଷରେ କରିଥିଲେ । ଏହା ଫଳରେ "ଚମ୍ପାରନ ଆଗ୍ରେରିଆନ ଆକ୍ଟ" ପ୍ରବର୍ତ୍ତିତ ହୋଇ ଶ୍ରମିକମାନଙ୍କର କ୍ଲେଶର ବହୁପରିମାଣ ଊଣା କରିପାରିଥିଲା । ପ୍ରାୟ ବର୍ଷକ ପରେ ୧୯୧୮ ମସିହାରେ ଏହି କୌଶଳର ଦ୍ୱିତୀୟ ପ୍ରୟୋଗ ଗୁଜରାଟର ଖେଡା ଜିଲ୍ଲାରେ କରାଯାଇଥିଲା । ସେଠାରେ କୃଷୀମାନେ ଚାରିମାସ ଯାବତ୍ ଅହିଂସ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ଚଳାଇ ସରକାରଙ୍କଠାରୁ ତାଙ୍କର ଦାବୀ ହାସଲ କରିପାରିଥିଲେ ।

୧୯୨୦ ମସିହାରେ ଅସହଯୋଗ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟପନ୍ଥାକୁ ଜାତୀୟ କଂଗ୍ରେସର ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନନୀତି ରୂପେ ଗ୍ରହଣ କରାଗଲା ଏହି ଅସହଯୋଗ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟପନ୍ଥା ଓ ଅହିଂସ ଭାବ ଦୁହିଙ୍କ ସମନ୍ୱୟରେ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହରେ ଗୋଟିଏ ଉଚ୍ଚତରକ୍ରମ ସୃଷ୍ଟି କରାଗଲା । ଏହାର ପରୀକ୍ଷା ପୁଣିଥରେ ବର୍ଦ୍ଦୋଲିଠାରେ ହେଲା ।

ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଅହିଂସା ନୀତିକୁ କେବଳ ଅନ୍ତର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶୀୟ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନର ସ୍ତମ୍ଭ ସ୍ୱରୂପ ଦେଖୁ ନ ଥିଲେ—ବହିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶୀୟ ଯୁଦ୍ଧ ସମ୍ପର୍କରେ ମଧ୍ୟ ତାଙ୍କର

ଏହି ନୀତିରେ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ ଅଟଳ ଥିଲା । ଏପରିକି ୧୯୪୧ ମସିହା ଡିସେମ୍ବର ମାସ ଶେଷ ଆଡ଼କୁ ଓ ନେହୁରୁଙ୍କ ଅଷ୍ଟମଥର ଜେଲ ଭୋଗ ଦଣ୍ଡରୁ ମୁକ୍ତି ପାଇଲା ପରେ, ବର୍ଦ୍ଧୋଲିଠାରେ କଂଗ୍ରେସ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟକାରୀ ସମିତିର ସଭ୍ୟମାନଙ୍କର ଯୁଦ୍ଧ ସମ୍ପର୍କରେ ଅହିଂସନୀତି ପ୍ରଯୁଜ୍ୟ ନୁହେଁ ଏହି ଯୁକ୍ତିରେ ଏକମତ ହୋଇ ନ ପାରି ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ କଂଗ୍ରେସର ନେତୃତ୍ୱ ତ୍ୟାଗ କରିଥିଲେ । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କ, ଅହିଂସା ନୀତିର ଆଚରଣ, ଜୀବନର ଓ ଜୀବନ ଧାରଣ ଢଙ୍ଗର ଦର୍ଶନତତ୍ତ୍ୱ ସ୍ୱରୂପ ପ୍ରତିଭାତ ହୋଇଥିଲା । ରାଜନୀତିରେ ଏହାର ପ୍ରୟୋଗ ଏହି ଦର୍ଶନ ତତ୍ତ୍ୱର ଆଂଶିକ ପ୍ରକାଶ ମାତ୍ର । ଦାରିଦ୍ର୍ୟରୁ ଉପୁଜିଥିବା ବହୁ ସାମାଜିକ ସମସ୍ୟା ଯଦ୍ୱାରା ବହୁଲୋକ ବୈଫଲ୍ୟ, ତିକ୍ତତା ଓ ହତାଶାଦ୍ୱାରା ମ୍ରିୟମାଣ ହୋଇ ପଡ଼ନ୍ତି, ଧନଶାଳୀ ଓ କ୍ଷମତାସମ୍ପନ୍ନ ଗୋଷ୍ଠୀଙ୍କର ସହାନୁଭୂତିହୀନତା, ନିଶ୍ଚେଷ୍ଟତା ଓ ଅନ୍ୟାୟର ଅହିଂସ ପ୍ରତିରୋଧ ଦ୍ୱାରା ସମାହିତ ହୋଇପାରେ । ଦୁର୍ନୀତି ଓ ଅସଦାଚରଣରେ ଲିପ୍ତଥିବା ଲୋକମାନଙ୍କ ସହିତ ଅସହଯୋଗ କରି ଓ ମନ୍ଦକାର୍ଯ୍ୟ ବିରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ନୈତିକ ଭାବରେ ଲଢ଼ି ସାମାଜିକ ନ୍ୟାୟର ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠା କରିବା ସମ୍ଭବ । ଅହିଂସଭାବ, ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିକୁ, ସମାଜକୁ ଓ ଜାତିକୁ ଏପରି ଶକ୍ତି ଦିଏ ଯାହା ଦୁଃଖ, କ୍ଳେଶ, ଲାଞ୍ଛନା ଓ ଯନ୍ତ୍ରଣା ମଧ୍ୟରେ ଜାଗ୍ରତ ଓ ଜୀବିତ ରହେ । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଦକ୍ଷିଣ ଆଫ୍ରିକାରେ ଜେଲରେ ୨୪୯ ଦିନ ଏବଂ ଭାରତର ଜେଲମାନଙ୍କରେ ୨୦୮୯ ଦିନ ଅତିବାହିତ କରିଥିଲେ । ତିଲକ ଯେ ୧୮୯୭ ମସିହାରେ ଥରେ ଜେଲ ବରଣ କରିଥିଲେ ଓ ୧୯୦୭ ମସିହା ଠାରୁ ୧୯୧୪ ମସିହା ଭିତରେ ଛଅବର୍ଷ ଜେଲରେ ଅତିବାହିତ କରିଥିଲେ, ସେ ଜଣେ କଠୋର ଜାତୀୟତାବାଦୀ ଥିଲେ ଓ ୧୯୨୦ ମସିହା ଅଗଷ୍ଟ ମାସରେ ମୃତ୍ୟୁ ପର୍ଯ୍ୟନ୍ତ ଭାରତର ଜାତୀୟ ସଂଗ୍ରାମର ମୁଖ୍ୟ ସେନାପତି ଥିଲେ । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ତାଙ୍କରି ଠାରୁ ନେତୃତ୍ୱର ଧ୍ୱଜା ଗ୍ରହଣ କରିଥିଲେ ଓ ୧୯୨୦ ମସିହାରୁ ୧୯୪୭ ମସିହା ପର୍ଯ୍ୟନ୍ତ ଭାରତର ଜାତୀୟତାପୋତକୁ ବିପ୍ଳବ ଓ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ ମଧ୍ୟରେ ଶୃଙ୍ଖଳାରେ ଚଳାଇ ମହିମାମୟ ସ୍ୱାଧୀନତାତଟଭୂମିରେ ଲଗାଇ ପାରିଥିଲେ । ୧୯୨୪ ମସିହାର ମାର୍ଚ୍ଚ ମାସ ୧୦ ତାରିଖ ଦିନ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଅସହଯୋଗ ଚ । ନ ଅପରାଧ ପାଇଁ ଧରାହୋଇ, ବିଚାରରେ ଛଅବର୍ଷ

କାରାଦଣ୍ଡ ପାଇଲେ । ନିଜକୁ ଦୋଷି ବୋଲି ମାନି ସେ କହିଥିଲେ "ମୁ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ କରେ ଯେ ଅସହଯୋଗ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନଦ୍ୱାରା, ମୁଁ ଭାରତ ଓ ଇଂଲଣ୍ଡ ଉଭୟ ଦେଶପାଇଁ ମଙ୍ଗଳକାର୍ଯ୍ୟ କରିପାରିଛି । ମୁଁ ଦେଖାଇ ଦେଇଛି ଯେ ଦୁଇଦେଶ ଅସ୍ୱାଭାବିକ ଅବସ୍ଥାରେ ଅଛନ୍ତି । ମୋ ମତରେ ଭଲ ସହିତ ସହଯୋଗ ଯେପରି କରିବା ମନ୍ଦ ସହିତ ଅସହଯୋଗ ମଧ୍ୟ ସେହିପରି କରିବା । ୧୯୪୮ ମସିହାରେ ନେହରୁ ସ୍ୱାଧୀନ ଭାରତର ଗୁରୁଭାର ନିଜ ମୁଣ୍ଡରେ ନେଇ ପାରିଥିଲେ । ସେ ନଅ ଥର ଜେଲ୍ ଭୋଗିଥିଲେ ଓ ୩୨୬୨ ଦିନ ଜେଲରେ ଅତିବାହିତ କରିଥିଲେ । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ନେହରୁଙ୍କୁ ତାଙ୍କର ଉତ୍ତରାଧିକାରୀ ରୂପେ ଗଢ଼ିଥିଲେ । ନେହରୁଙ୍କ ସମ୍ବନ୍ଧରେ ସେ କହିଥିଲେ "ସେ ସ୍ୱଚ୍ଛ ପଥର ପରି ନିର୍ମଳ ଓ ତାଙ୍କ ସତ୍ୟବାଦିତାରେ ସନ୍ଦେହର ଅବକାଶ ନାହିଁ । ଦେଶ ତାଙ୍କ ହାତରେ ନିରାପଦ ଓ ମୁଁ ଜାଣେ, ମୋ ଉତ୍ତାରୁ ସେ ଠିକ ମୋ ପରି ରହିବେ ।"

ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ସାଧାରଣ ଅନଶନ ବା ଆମରଣ ଅନଶନ ବ୍ରତ ରାଜନୀତିକ ଦୃଷ୍ଟି କୋଣରୁ ସମସ୍ତଙ୍କର ଅବୋଧ୍ୟ । ଏପରିକି ତାଙ୍କର ଘନିଷ୍ଠ ସହକର୍ମୀ ଓ ବରିଷ୍ଠ ନେତୃବର୍ଗ ତାଙ୍କର ଅନଶନ ବ୍ରତର ଅର୍ଥ ବୁଝି ପାରୁନଥିଲେ । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ନିଜେ ଏହାକୁ ଆତ୍ମଶୁଦ୍ଧି କ୍ରିୟା ବୋଲି କହୁଥିଲେ । ମାତ୍ର ଏହାଦ୍ୱାରା ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ କୌଣସି ରାଜନୀତିକ ବା ସାମାଜିକ ଅନ୍ୟାୟ ବା ଦୁର୍ନୀତି ପ୍ରତି ସରକାର ତଥା ଜନସାଧାରଣଙ୍କର ଦୃଷ୍ଟି ଆକର୍ଷଣ କରିପାରୁଥିଲେ, ଓ ଏହାକୁ ଏହି ଅନ୍ୟାୟ ଅଥବା ଦୁର୍ନୀତି ବିରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ଅସ୍ତ୍ରସ୍ୱରୂପ ବ୍ୟବହାର କରିପାରୁଥିଲେ । ୧୯୩୨ ମସିହା ସେପ୍ଟେମ୍ବର ମାସରେ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଜେଲରେ ଥିବା ଅବସ୍ଥାରେ ୨୦ ତାରିଖ ଠାରୁ ଆମରଣ ଅନଶନ କରିବା ନିଷ୍ପତ୍ତି ଘୋଷଣା କଲେ । କାରଣ ସେ ଜାଣିବାକୁ ପାଇଲେ ଯେ "କମ୍ୟୁନାଲ ଆୱାର୍ଡ଼" ବା ସାମ୍ପ୍ରଦାୟିକ ନିଷ୍ପତ୍ତି ପ୍ରଣୟନ କରି ବ୍ରିଟିଶ ସରକାର ଅସ୍ଥାୟୀ ବନ୍ଦୋବସ୍ତ ସ୍ୱରୂପ ସଂଖ୍ୟାଲଘୁ ସମ୍ପ୍ରଦାୟଙ୍କପାଇଁ ବିଧାନ ସଭାରେ ସଂରକ୍ଷିତ ସ୍ଥାନ ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦିଷ୍ଟ କରୁଥିଲେ । ବିଶେଷ କରି ତଫସିଲଭୁକ୍ତ ଜାତି ଓ ସାମ୍ପ୍ରଦାୟର ଲୋକଙ୍କପାଇଁ ଏହି ବ୍ୟବସ୍ଥା ହୋଇଥିବାର ଜାଣି ସେ ମର୍ମାହତ ହେଲେ—କାରଣ ଏହି ଶ୍ରେଣୀର ଲୋକମାନଙ୍କ ଉନ୍ନତିପାଇଁ ସେ

ଆପ୍ରାଣ ଚେଷ୍ଟା ଚଳାଇଥିଲେ । ସେ ଅନୁଭବ କଲେ ଯେ ଏହି ବ୍ୟବସ୍ଥା ଦ୍ୱାରା ହିନ୍ଦୁଧର୍ମ ଖଣ୍ଡ ବିଖଣ୍ଡିତ ହୋଇଯିବ ଓ ଧର୍ମଭାବ ବ୍ୟାହତ ହେବ । ଛଅଦିନ ମଧ୍ୟରେ ମିଳିତ ନିର୍ବାଚନ ମଣ୍ଡଳୀ ଗ୍ରହଣ ରହିବା ସପକ୍ଷରେ ଚୁକ୍ତି ହେବା ଫଳରେ ୨୬ ତାରିଖ ଦିନ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଅନଶନ ଭାଙ୍ଗିଲେ । ଏହାର ଅନ୍ୟ ବିଶେଷ ଫଳ ହେଲା ଯେ ତାଙ୍କର ଅନଶନ ସମସ୍ତ ମଧ୍ୟରେ, ଅନେକ ଦେବାଳୟ ହରିଜନମାନଙ୍କ ପାଇଁ ଉନ୍ମୁକ୍ତ ହେଲା, ବିଶିଷ୍ଟ ହିନ୍ଦୁ ଭଦ୍ର ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିମାନେ ଅସ୍ପୃଶ୍ୟ ଜାତିର ଲୋକଙ୍କ ସହିତ ପ୍ରଥମ କରି ଏକାଠି ଭୋଜନ କଲେ, ବହୁ ଗ୍ରାମରେ ଲୋକେ ହରିଜନମାନଙ୍କୁ କୂଅରୁ ପାଣି ନେବାକୁ ଛାଡ଼ିଦେଲେ । ବହୁକାଳରୁ ସମାଜରେ ଚଳି ଆସୁଥିବା ଅଛୁଆଁ ଡାଏରି ଭାଙ୍ଗିଗଲା ।

ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ସାମ୍ପ୍ରଦାୟିକ ଭେଦଭାବକୁ ରାଜନୀତିରୁ ସମ୍ପୂର୍ଣ୍ଣ ଅଲଗା ରଖିବାକୁ ପାରୁପର୍ଯ୍ୟନ୍ତ ଚେଷ୍ଟା କରୁଥିଲେ । ତାଙ୍କର କର୍ମମୟ ଜୀବନର ଇତିହାସରେ ହିନ୍ଦୁମୁସଲମାନଙ୍କର ଐକ୍ୟ ଓ ଭ୍ରାତୃଭାବ ବଢ଼ାଇବା ଦିଗରେ ତାଙ୍କର ଉଦ୍ୟମ, ଉତ୍ସାହ ଓ କାର୍ଯ୍ୟପନ୍ଥା ଅମର ଅକ୍ଷରରେ ଲେଖା ହେବ । ଖିଲାଫତ ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନରୁ ଆରମ୍ଭ କରି ଭାରତର ବିଭକ୍ତୀକରଣ ପରେ ମୁସଲମାନମାନଙ୍କର ନିରାପତ୍ତା ପାଇଁ ଆମରଣ ଅନଶନ କରିବାର ତାଙ୍କର ଦୃଢ଼ ପ୍ରତିଜ୍ଞା ସମସ୍ତ ପର୍ଯ୍ୟନ୍ତ ବିତିଥିବା ଦୀର୍ଘକାଳ ମଧ୍ୟରେ· ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ କେବେ ହେଲେ, ହିନ୍ଦୁମୁସଲମାନ ମୈତ୍ରୀନୀତି ପଥରୁ ବିଚଳିତ ହୋଇ ନ ଥିଲେ । ୧୯୪୬ ମସିହା ଅଗଷ୍ଟ ୧୬ ତାରିଖ ଦିନ ମୁସଲମାନମାନେ 'ପ୍ରତ୍ୟକ୍ଷ ସଂଗ୍ରାମ' ଦିବସ ପାଳିବାପାଇଁ ଜିନ୍ନାଙ୍କ ଆହ୍ୱାନର ଫଳସ୍ୱରୂପ ଓ ୧୯୪୭ ମସିହା ଅଗଷ୍ଟ ୧୫ ପନ୍ଦର ଦିନ ଭାରତ ଓ ପାକିସ୍ଥାନ ଅଲଗା ରାଜ୍ୟରୂପେ ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠିତ ହେବା ପଛେ ପଛେ ଯେଉଁ ନିର୍ମମ ହତ୍ୟାକାଣ୍ଡ, ଲୁଣ୍ଠନ, ନିକ୍ଷେପଣ ଘଟିବାଦ୍ୱାରା କୋଟି କୋଟି ଲୋକ ମଲେ, ଗୃହହୀନ, ଧନହୀନ ଓ କୁଟୁମ୍ବହୀନ ହେଲେ, ସେହି ହିଂସାବହ୍ନିକୁ ଶାନ୍ତ କରିପାରିଥିଲା କେବଳ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ଅପରିସୀମ ନୈତିକଶକ୍ତି ଓ ସାହସ । ଏ ଶକ୍ତି ଓ ସାହସର ଦୃଷ୍ଟାନ୍ତ ପୃଥିବୀରେ ବିରଳ ମାତ୍ର ସୃଷ୍ଟିର ପରିହାସ ସ୍ୱରୂପ, ଅହିଂସାର ସେହି ନିର୍ଭୀକ ପ୍ରଚାରକ ଓ ନିଷ୍ଠାପର ସେବକ, ନିର୍ମମ ଆତତାୟୀର ହିଂସାସ୍ରୋତରେ ପ୍ରାଣ ହରାଇଲେ ।

କ୍ଷମତାରେ ଅସୀନ ପ୍ରତଦ୍ୱନ୍ଦୀ ଗୋଷ୍ଠୀପ୍ରତ ବପଦର ଆଶଙ୍କା ଥିଲେ ଅଥବା ସେହିଗୋଷ୍ଠୀ ଅସୁବଧାଜନକ ପରସ୍ଥିତରେ ସମ୍ମୁଖୀନ ହେଲେ, ସେହି ଅବସ୍ଥାରୁ ରାଜନୀତକ ଲଭ ଉଠାଇବାକୁ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଅବାଞ୍ଛନୀୟ ମନେ କରୁଥିଲେ । ୧୯୨୪ ମସିହା ଫେବୃଆରୀ ·ମାସରେ ଯେତେବେଳେ ଗାନ୍ଧୀ ଜେଲରୁ ମୁକ୍ତ ହେଲେ ଓ ସରକାର ତାଙ୍କର ଛଅବର୍ଷ କାରାଦଣ୍ଡରୁ ଭୋଗ ହୋଇ ନ ଥିବା ଅଂଶ ଛାଡ଼ିଦେଲେ, ସେହି ସମୟରେ ଭାରତର ବହୁ ସ୍ଥାନରେ ସନ୍ତ୍ରାସବାଦୀ ଦଳମାନଙ୍କର ହିଂସାତ୍ମକ-କାର୍ଯ୍ୟ ଦେଖି ଅତଶୟ. କ୍ଷୁବ୍ଧ ହେଲେ । ସେ ଲେଖିଥିଲେ ଆମ୍ଭେମାନେ ପ୍ରତଜ୍ଞାବଦ୍ଧ ହୋଇଥିଲେ ଯେ ଆମ୍ଭେମାନେ ଶାସକଗୋଷ୍ଠୀର ପ୍ରତଦ୍ୱନ୍ଦୀ ଅଥବା ସହଯୋଗୀ ସମସ୍ତଙ୍କପ୍ରତ ଅଥବା ପରସ୍ପର ପ୍ରତ ଅହିଂସ ହେବା । ସେମାନଙ୍କର ହୃଦୟ ଭିତରକୁ ଆମର ନବେଦନ ପହଞ୍ଚାଇବା ଓ ସେମାନଙ୍କ ଭିତରେ ଥିବା ଯେତେ ଭଲ ଗୁଣ ସବୁକୁ ସକ୍ରିୟ କରବା । ଅମର ସ୍ୱାର୍ଥ ସାଧନ ପାଇଁ ତାଙ୍କୁ ଭୟଭୀତ କରବା ନାହିଁ । ମାତ୍ର ଆମ୍ଭେମାନେ ଏହି ପ୍ରତଶ୍ରୁତ ପାଳନାହୁଁ । ଆମ୍ଭେମାନେ ପ୍ରତଦ୍ୱନ୍ଦୀମାନଙ୍କପ୍ରତ ଅସହିଷ୍ଣୁ ହୋଇଅଛୁ । ଆମର ନଜର ଦେଶର ଲୋକମାନେ ଆମ୍ଭମାନଙ୍କୁ ସନ୍ଦେହ କରୁଅଛନ୍ତ । ସେମାନେ ଅହିଂସା ନୀତରେ ବଶ୍ୱାସ କର ପାରୁନାହାନ୍ତ ।

ପୁନଶ୍ଚ, ଦ୍ୱିତୀୟ ପୃଥିବୀ ଯୁଦ୍ଧର ମଧ୍ୟଭାଗରେ ଯେତେବେଳେ, ବ୍ରିଟେନ ବହୁ ବପର୍ଯ୍ୟୟଗ୍ରସ୍ତ ହୋଇଥିଲ ଏବଂ ଆମଦେଶର ନେତାମାନଙ୍କମଧ୍ୟରୁ ଅନେକେ ଏହି ଅବସ୍ଥାର ସୁଯୋଗ ନେଇ ବ୍ରିଟେନ ବରୁଦ୍ଧରେ ସମସ୍ତ ଶକ୍ତ ବନଯୋଗ କର ଆନ୍ଦୋଳନ କରବାକୁ ଦୃଢ଼ ଭାବରେ ଦାବୀ କରୁଥିଲେ, ସେତେବେଳେ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଏହି ପ୍ରସ୍ତାବର ପ୍ରତରୋଧ କରଥିଲେ । ସେ କହିଲେ "ଆମ୍ଭେମାନେ ଇଂଲଣ୍ଡର ଧ୍ୱଂସ ଭିତରୁ ଆମର ସ୍ୱାଧୀନତା ଲୋଡ଼ୁନାହୁଁ । ଏହା ଅହିଂସାର ମାର୍ଗ ନୁହେଁ" ସେ କେବଳ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତଗତ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହ କରବା ସପକ୍ଷରେ ରାଜି ହୋଇଥିଲେ । କାରଣ ଭାରତର ବଡ଼ଲାଟ କେନ୍ଦ୍ର ବାଧନ ସଭାର ପରାମର୍ଶ ନ ନେଇ ନଜେ ନଜେ ଭାରତ ଯୁଦ୍ଧରେ ଯୋଗ ଦେଲ ବୋଲ ଘୋଷଣା କଲେ ଓ ଭାରତୀୟ ସୈନ୍ୟମାନଙ୍କୁ ଯୁଦ୍ଧ କ୍ଷେତ୍ରକୁ ପଠାଇବାର

ନିଷ୍ପତ୍ତି କଲେ । ଏହି କାର୍ଯ୍ୟର ପ୍ରତିବାଦ ଜଣାଇବାପାଇଁ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ବ୍ୟକ୍ତିଗତ ସତ୍ୟାଗ୍ରହ ପାଇଁ ଅନୁମତି ଦେଲେ ।

ଚଳିତ ଶତାବ୍ଦୀ ଆଣବିକ ହିଂସାର ବିକଟାଳ ରୂପ ଧରି ଠିଆ ହୋଇଛି । ମହାତ୍ମାଗାନ୍ଧୀ କେନେଡ଼ି ଭ୍ରାତାଦ୍ୱୟ ମାର୍ଟିନ ଲୁଥର କିଙ୍ଗ ହିଂସାର ବଳି ହୋଇଚନ୍ତି । କିନ୍ତୁ ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀଙ୍କର ଧୀର ଗମ୍ଭୀର ବାଣୀ ଏହି ଯୁଗର ନିଷ୍ଠୁର ହିଂସାତ୍ମକ ଉତ୍ତେଜନା ମଧ୍ୟରେ ପରିଷ୍କାର ଶୁଣାଯାଉଚି । ଗାନ୍ଧୀଜୀ ଆମକୁ ଦେଖାଇଛନ୍ତି ଯେ ମନ୍ଦକୁ ପ୍ରତିରୋଧ କରିବାପାଇଁ ଅହିଂସ ମାର୍ଗ ଅଛି । ପୃଥିବୀଯାକ ଏହି ମାର୍ଗ ବୁଝି ପାରୁଛନ୍ତି ଓ ସାମାଜିକ ନ୍ୟାୟ, ବର୍ଣ୍ଣସାମ୍ୟ ଏବଂ ରାଜନୀତିକ ସ୍ୱାଧୀନତା ଲାଭ ପାଇଁ ଏହି ମାର୍ଗ ଅନୁସରଣ କରୁଛନ୍ତି ।

— ———

RELEVANCE OF GANDHIN POLITIACAL IDEAS FOR THE MODERN WORLD

Dr. Benudhar Pradhan

Gandhiji is often chided as a revivalist, and an obscurantist, in the realm of economic doctrine. It is argued that through his advocacy for revival of the spinning-wheel, cottage and small-scale industries and labour-intensive methods of production and downright opposition to big machines and factory system of production he was making a vain bid to bring back the bullock-cart economy to India. While in the economic domain he is a controversial figure, and is considered as a pedastrian, yet in the realm of political ideas, he was far ahead of the nuclear age, nay, the age of the space-craft, trying to trot the surface of the moon.

Strictly speaking Gandhiji was not a politician. No doubt he galvanised the Indian liberation struggle by championing the cause of the masses and thereby enlisting their support, and changed the tenor of the movement by adding social and economic horizons to the political struggle. He was the spirit behind the

Indian National Congress, the Vanguard of the Indian nationalists, whether a member of the Party or not, whether holding any office in the Party or otherwise, he was the chief spokesman, of the Indian nationlism in ferment in relation to the British Government, and her representatives. He was the politician-par-excellence of resurgent India, treading the steps of the Buckingham Palace. Yet Gandhiji was not a politician in the accepted sense of the term. He was essentially a deeply religious man. It was only by an accident that he was drawn to the political arena. The historical forces pushed him to the forefront of Indian politics. Yet although he embraced politics deliberately, he had no mean ambition to occupy a position of vantage, or capture any office of profit, or to seek any personal laurel in Independent India. When independence came, instead of indulging in the scramble for power, or office, Gandhiji was fasting in Beliaghata, brooding over the evils of partition. If he stepped into the arena of politics, his was a disinterested motive, of redeeming politics from the slough of immorality and irrationality, and lend it a moral, rational, and a religious tone and temper.

As Gandhiji has himself said :

> "If I seem to take part in politics it is only because politics to-day encircle us like the coils of a snake from which one cannot get out no matter, how one tries I wish to wrestle with the snake, ······· I am trying to introduce religion into politics."

Politics in the modern world has degenerated into a game whose governing rules are cunning and craft, expediency and unscrupulousness. It may not be necessarily immoral, but it is atleast a End justifies the means and Machiavellism is normally considered as the supreme political virtue. But Gandhiji tried to salvage politics from the debris of amorality and Machiavellism, and spiritualise politics. Gandhiji demonstrated by his conduct that politics is not only inseparable from ethics, it is simply the extension of ethics to the realm of public affairs. For Gandhiji, means was as important as the end, or still more important than the latter. Politics was not an exception to it according to Gandhiji. It must be grounded on truth and shall employ the implements of non-violence and satyagraha to achieve its goal.

While Gandhiji spearheaded the Indian revolt against the British-raj in India, he did not harbour bitterness or animosity against the British Government or the British people. He was a true friend of the Britishers, who was never smitten by rancour or bitterness although waging a constant war against British Imperialism. Even during the war of liberation, he did never deviate from the principle that the means must be pure and noble, and if liberation from British dominion was a noble end, the means must be equally noble, and shall be founded on love and non-violence. Truth and non-violence showed him the way that one should not take advantage of the distress of his adversaries, to win a point or to gain a political advantage. Politics was not a questian of tactful bargaining for Gandhiji. It was a question of high moral principle, duty and sacrifice, and love of the adversary. Hence although he was fighting the war of the Indian settlers against the white Governments of South Africa, yet during the Boar-war and the Zulu rebillion, he organised ambulance corps in defence of the Natal Government. Subsequently when the World War I brokeout, Gandhiji's co-operation with the British Government was not wanting. On his

way home, he organised volunteers in defence of the British Government's war-effort and on his arrival in India, he persuaded the Indian politicians to suspend the agitation during the war and resume the same after the termination of the war. It may look as an irony of history that Gandhiji, the Father of The Indian Nation would accept decoration from the British Government for his services to the imperialistic war waged by Great Britain He also adopted the same line of policy after the outbreak of the Second World War.

Hence although a politician—of course not in the accepted sense of the term—his political scruples, inherited from his experiment with truth would not condone selfishness, but would extol self-suffering as the highest political virtue and diplomatic instrument to fight the adversary. A revolutionary that he was, he fought the battle, not with arms and ammunitions, either conventional or nuclear, but with fasting and self-suffering. the technique being directed not at coercing the adversary physically, nor to extort from him concessions, by inflicting on him sufferings, but by coercing him psychologically, rousing in him sympathy and pity, and by

converting him to your way of thought. Hence although Gandhiji was the Knight Errant, fighting the battle of the weak, against suffering and injustice, yet he fought the battle with an instrument, least depended upon, for waging war. He played the game of Real Politic with an overtone of idealism and spiritualism. That the Karen rebels of Burma, seated around the fireside, read Mahatma's solution or late Martin Luther King, fought non-violently for the civil rights of the Negroes, or the Czechoslovakian youth putting up very recently, non-violent resistance against the Soviet occupation forces are epitomes of inherent wisdom of Gandhian political ideas, and its relevance for the modern world.

Gandhian concept of non-violent state has also its relevance for the modern world, rather the only relevant theory for the modern world. Whether it is the Fascist or the Nazi state or the Communist or the Socialist State, there has been so much arrogation of powers by the state that the individuals are helpless spectators of diminution of their own power and dignity. With the coming into vogue of the recurring economic crises, centralised state planning, and prolifera-

tion of situations, that make emergencies normal feature of modern life, the state and the Government have become the repository of all power and dignity, and the power and dignity of the individual is at a discount. Thus with every increase in the dimension of state powers, the scope for the blossoming of individuality dwindles in the reverse direction. The tragedy of the modern world with such accretion of the powers of the state has been very appropriately highlighated by Sri Bertrand Russell thus :

> "There is over a large part of the earth's surface, something not unlike a reversion to the ancient Egyptian system of divine kingship controlled by a newly priestly caste.................... Individual initiative is hemmed in either by powerful state or by powerful corporations."

The problem that stares at the face is how to restrain the authority of the state and the Government, and open a wider vista for the proliferation of individual initiative and originality. Gandhiji provided the answer by contriving a non-violent state as the immediate objective and complete evaporation of the state as the ultimate goal.

A socially conscious individual occupies the centre of the stage in Gandhiji's scheme of social and political organisation. Although the prosperity of the society is never to be lost sight of by the individual, yet the development of the latter, his mental, moral and material growth is of primary significance in a social framework. Gandhiji's ideal society is one where the individuals are socially conscious beings, aware of social responsibility and practising cent per cent personal Swaraj, or self-rule. In such a state of human and social relationship, the State shall be a superfluity. But while in the ideal society of his conception, where individuals are socially conscious beings practising self-restraint or personal Swaraj, the state shall be superfluous, yet due to the imperfection of men they fail to develop and exhibit a socially-conscious and socially-oriented conscience and fail to practise self-restraint in their social relationship. Hence the need is felt for a coercive and force-employing agency, to ensure sociability in the individual and make him perfect fit in the social framework. The state is such an organisation, a force-employing and coereive organ. Accordingly said Gandhiji, "The state represents violence in a concentrated and organised form."

Thus the state of the modern world according to Gandhiji, based on violence and coercion, is not an ideal objective, but a necessary evil, necessitated because of the imperfections of individuals. It is a means to the end, the end being the mental, moral, and the material development of the individual, or the development of his best-self. Hence arrogation of powers by the state and diminution of the dignity of the individual is viewed by Gandhiji with alarm and apprehension.

> "I look upon an increase in the powers of the state with the greatest fear because while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress."

As a corrective against the all-pervasive authority of the centralised state, Gandhiji visualised a decentralised system of social organisation, wherein, the powers, authority, and directions of the state are reduced to a minimum. Gandhiji would commend that state which enjoys least amount of power exercises least amount of authority. "I suggest" he once remarked

"that if India is to evolve along non-violent lines, it will have to decentralise many things." Accordingly the pattern of political and social organisation that shall eliminate the oddities and absurdities of the all-pervasive authorities of the state which sets the individuality and dignity of the citizens at naught, is a community of self-sufficient and self-governing villages where sociability and voluntary, co-operation forms the bedrock of normal social behaviour. The self-governing and self-sufficient villages shall be communities where individual freedom and the dignity of the individual shall occupy the centre of the political stage. The function of the state shall be confined to ensuring the enjoyment of freedom by the individual and paving the path for its furtherance, in the social framework instead of crushing and cramping their growth.

Hence the social and the political system, that solves the problems of the centralised and bureaucratised, modern state system has been protrayed by Gandhiji thus :

> "In this structure composed of innumerable villages .... life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic

> circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals. The outer circumference will not wield power to crush the inner-circle, but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it."

Gandhiji's strategy of Non-violence in politics has also its relevance in the world torn by the cold war and ideological cleavages and studded with nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. After the invention of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the world has so much been drawn to to the brink of disastrous wars that human survival poses a grave problem. It has therefore been calculated that nuclear war if there shall be any, shall not leave behind victor or the vanquished, As Sir Bertrand Russell has very appropriately observed, in case of a nuclear war, "Neither side can defeat the other except by defeating itself at the same time." Hence in the world threatened by nuclear holocausts any saner and sober method of settling international disputes, that shall extort victory for both the

sides shall have to be fought with non-violence, love, faith and understanding. It won't be inappropriate to quote with approbation one of the great scientist and Noble-laureate W. Heisenberg.

> "Hence it seems that Gandhiji's way of thinking can lead directly into the political structure of the future world, in which a nation might be much better protected by not possessing atomic weapons than by having them, or might pursue its own interests much more efficiently by participating in the interests of other nations than by ignoring them. It was the unique example given by Gandhi which demonstrated that the most sincere personal engagement combined with complete renunciation of violence can lead to great political success. We all are indebted to him for this example."

Thus the Gandhian strategy of non-violence in politics, has not only its validity for a resurgent people, fighting for nationhood; it has also its relevance as a remedy against the centralised, bureaucratised, and all pervasive powers of the

modern state that compromises the dignity of the individual and more so for the modern world that is studded with nuclear weapons and drags us perforce to the brink of thermo-nuclear holocausts. It is now high time that statesmen the world over, grasp the relevance of Gandhian technique for the modern world and take timely steps to reorganise the national and international policy in line with the Gandhian prescription so that the world is rid of much of avoidable social and political tension.

EQUALITY : AN ASPECT OF GANDHIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

T. Satpathy,
Dept. of Economics, B. J. B. College,

Gandhiji was essentially a practical idealist continuously striving throughout his life for creation of an ideal society solidly based on the foundation of equality-economic, political and social. A correct appreciation of his concept of economic equality has naturally to be viewed from a larger angle encompassing the entire horizon of his economic philosophy. Gandhiji wanted the replacement of the 'direct economy of needs' and money values by life values. He cherished the dawn of a society founded on economic simplicity eliminating gross economic materialism. He frequently pointed out the evils of the present monetization of our economy. He had fully realized that the predominance of economic motive would inevitably breed violence, inequality and consequent degradation of human values. His treatment of economic equality is tinged with socio-economic-cum-moral issues. He had an irresistible passion for social, economic and

Political transformation and reconstruction and he had chosen non-violence as the most potent weapon for all these. Gandhiji was an Utopian and means were very fundamental to him· He stressed decentralization and non-possession· To him the only alternative to the danger of robotism was humanistic communitarianism. As a reformer of extraordinary merit, he made a through disection of the body politic and had a microscopic view of its ailments. Gandhiji's analysis of economic inequality can be illustrated by an observation of Kjellen. kjellen once ventured an observation that " Occassion makes the thief." This amply demonstrates the prevalent flaw in society and environment and also simultaneously stresses the pressing need for economic and social reforms. This rejects the thesis that "The thief can find out Occassions." This is probably clear in Gandhiji's analysis wherein we find an elaborate note asto how the present civilization with all its manifestation of inequality has brought about degeneration.

Economic equality to Gandhiji meant abolition of the enternal conflict between capital and labour· With very deep concern to the poor he wrote "The Contrast between the palaces of New Delhi and the miserable hovels of the poor

labouring class nearby cannot last." He continued "The contract between the rich and the poor to-day is a painful sight. The poor villagers are exploited by the foreign Government and also by their own countrymen—the city dwellers. They produce the food and go hungry. They produce milk and their children go without it. It is disgraceful. Every one must have balanced diet, a decent house to live in, facilities for the education of one's children and adequate medical relief." These few sentences simply show his deep concern for the have-nots and the underdogs. In fact he lived upto the maxim "Wherever pain is, there am I." In clear, unambiguous and categorical terms he showed the extent nature and consequences of inequality prevalent now.

Attainment of equality to him meant "the levelling down of the few rich in whose hands are concentrated the bulk of the nation's wealth on the one hand and a leveling up of the semi-starved, naked millions on the other. A non-violent system of Government (which was very dear to Gandhiji) is not possible so long as this wide gulf between the rich and poor persists."

Economic equality of Gandhiji's conception did not actually mean that every one would

have exactly the same amount. He did not stand for complete equality of wealth and income. To him equality meant that every body should have enough for his needs. To illustrate this point he cited several examples. A fair analysis of all his writings and illustrations would take us to the inevitable conclusion that to him the real meaning of equality was "To each according to his need". This conclusion has courted two sets of diametrically opposite comments and criticisms.

One school of thought brands his thinking on these lines as purely Marxian. To them Karl Marx has exactly advocated this system of each according to his need and this is purely socialism. However Gandhiji has his own thought provoking answer to this criticism He said that he had no quarrel with Marxism or Communism as such. He would have gladly embraced non-violent socialism to usher in economic equality. He, in fact differed from Marxism in methods and means. He writes "There is gross inequality to-day. The basis of socialism is economic equality. There can be no Ramarajya in the present State of inequitous in equalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses donot get even to eat. I accepted the theory of socialism even while I was in South Africa. My

opposition to the socialists and others consists in attacking violence as a means of effecting any lasting reform". He, in fact gave a clarion call to all truthful, non-violent and pure-hearted socialists to join hands to establish a socialistic society in India.

Again the same analysis which was termed as Marxian was also condemned as reactionany. The leftist thinkers considered Gandhiji's advocacy of 'to each according to his need' as a reactionary thought giving a prop to the bourgeoisie to perpetuate inequalities of wealth saying that Gandhiji needed a revolution pionnered by bourgeoisie and was a true representative of the said class and hence tried to safeguard their interests by pleading that each should get on the basis of his need. Well, this criticism had clear answar from Mahatma. He distinctly said "Let none try to justify the glaring difference between the classes and the masses, the prince and the pauper, by saying that the former need more. That will be an idle sophistry and travesty of my argument". This critieism also loses much of its validity when we see what a profoundly revolutionary phenomenon was brought about by the so called reactionary ideas of Gandhiji.

The Gandhian technique for bringing about an egalitarian society is basically an ethical consideration. He evolved the concept of statutory trusteeship as an instrument for attainment of economic equality. He said that the owners of wealth should chose between classwar and voluntarily converting themselves into trustees of their wealth. He predicted that "a violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day, unless there is a voluntory abdication of riches". This trusteeship meant "that the owners of wealth would be allowed to retain the steward-ship of their possessions and to use their talents to increase the wealth, not for their own sakes, but for the sake of the nation and therefore without exploitation the state would regulate the rate of commission which they would get commensurate with the service rendered and its value to society. Their children would inherit the stewardship only if they proved their fitness for it." Gandhiji said that with the advent of independence, all the capitalists would have an opportunity of becoming statutory trustees. But such a statute "will not be imposed from above. It will have to come from below. When the people understand the implication of trusteeship and the atmosphere is ripe for it the peaple

themselves beginning with Grama panchayats will begin to introduce such statutes.Such a thing coming from below is easy to swallow. Coming from above, it is liable to prove a dead weight". Gandhiji not only enunciated the conception of trusteeship but went on to point out that trusteeship can be achieved by means of non-cooperation. He said "No person can amass wealth without the co-operation, willing or forced, of the people concerned", This concept of trusteeship came out of his conviction that after the honourable livelihood is met, the rest of the wealth belongs to the community. Further olarifying the stand he said "I want them out grow their greed and sense of possession and come down inspite of their wealth to the level of those who earn their livelihood by labour". Hence concept of trusteeship is a question of conviction and a principle of unadulterated non-violenee. According to Gandhiji the root of the doctrine of equal distribution lies in the trusteeship of the wealthy for the superfluous wealth possessed by them.

This idea of trusteeship has evoked many uncharitable comments from many a quarters. It has not only been termed as a reactionary concept designed to maintain status quo in

distribution of wealth and income, but also has been ridiculed to be a legal fiction. Further the critics have found that selfishness of individual in all ages is assumed to be more or less of equal degree and seen from this angle the trusteeship of Gandhiji sounds like Divine Right Theory of Kings.

Introspective, as he was, Gandhiji has been clearly conscious of this criticism. but he still struck to his point. He said "I adhere to my doctrine of trusteeship inspite of the rifdicule that has been poured upon it. It is true that it is difficult to reach. So is non-violence difficult to attain. But we made up our minds in 1920 to negotiate that step. We have found it worth the effort". He stoutly refuted the criticism that the concept of trusteeship is reactionary and said that he had no hesitation to accept non-violent communism, which is explicit in the first verse of Ishopanisad. He thought that trusteeship is not a legal fiction but is attainable in practice by non-violent non-cooperation. He also rejected the criticism that trusteeship is like Divine Right theory. He said that trusteeship is the life force of humanistic communitarianism. Finally Gandhiji made it clear that our society might

not reach the goal, but it should be the duty of every true Indian to set his sail to-wards that goal of equality and no other.

Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi

By-Hari Hara Das.

Gandhism is not an utopian political ideal, a distinctive political creed or a mere philosophy based upon armchair theorsing, Unlike other modern isms, Gandhism does not prescribe rigid rules or any particular pattern of life for guiding the people, Gandhiji had no pretentions to be a philosopher or for that matter to propound any ism with distinctive features to guide either individual or group activity. He was essentially a religious man—a man of action and intuition. He was a realist and a pragmatist and the tinge of mysticism which was some times noticed in his activities was largely due to the fact that he received his marching orders from God. In his own words, he was not a politician masquarading as a religious man, but a religious man who was dragged into politics, because of his great concern for fellow human beings. He was a humanist and had tremendous faith in the essential goodness of man.

Gandhiji's deep concern for the exploited mass of India dragged him into the hot bed of

politics for emancipating them from the yoke of foreign domination. The achievement of Swaraj therefore was the highest ideal and Gandhiji adopted the non-violent means as the instrument of his political programme. Gandhism is a product of the practical experience of Mahatma Gandhi. He practised, whatever he professed and did not ask the people to follow something which he had not practised in his own life. These principles, which were followed by Mahatma Gandhi were woven into a political philosophy by his followers under the label of, Gandhism. Gandhiji did not find any difference between thought and action, with him to think was to act. Comparing Thorean and Gandhiji, Pyarelal writes, there is no logic and system building in their political philosophy. Both are essentially truth seekers and truth speakers. In the preface to his book. "The political philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya," Dr. V. P. Varma has rightly observed that "Gandhism does not have the philosophical depth and subtelity of academic analysis which is found in the works of Plato, Sankara and Kant, but there is a tremendous impact of Gandhian teachings in India and the world." He again writes that, "Gandhiji's strongest point is that he attempted

to live according to his teachings. The sincere effort for the practical realisation of his ideas in his own life, in the lives of the inmates of the Ashrama and in the social, economic and the political life of India, imparts to Gandhian teachings a great solidity."

The modern world sent asunder as it is by mutual hatred and conflict, strife and war, badly needs the Gandhian message of truth, love and nonviolence for eradicating the maladies. To-day there is lack of harmony not only between man and man, class and class and nation and nation but also within the man himself, Possibly at no other time in human history the entire human race was faced with the danger of being completely annihilated. Scientific and technological developments while increasing the destructive power of the individual a millionfold, have miserably failed to achieve the development of the moral personality of the individual in equal properation. This has given rise to diplomacy of the worse type, Duplicite, power-politics, war, exploitation, suppression of the people by force and territorial aggrendisement have characterised the modern world civilization. Human soul is depraved and

through a continuous process of degradation and demoralisation man to-day is compelled to behave like a brute. Machiavellian double Standards, Hobbesian absolutism and Hegelian deification of state power and war have formed the very basis of political relationship in the modern world. Toomuch emphasis on material values and almost a criminal negligence of the spiritual aspect of life has given rise to violent wars, hated of each other, absence of respect for human-virtues, chaos and confusion. Treachery and duplicity have become the order of the present day world. In the absence of the moral and spiritual elevation of the human society, we will not be able to enjoy the fruits of these scientific and technological developments as we may destroy ourselves due to our foolishness. The only corrective for this state of affairs is the whole hearted acceptance of the philosophy of life propounded by Gandhiji and the establishment of an essentially non-violent society based upon the principles of love and truth.

Gandhiji was a patriot who fervently desired the independence of India from the yoke of foreign domination. He had immense

contribution to the rise and development of Indian nationalism. The Indian national movement achieved new dimensions under Gandhiji's leadership. He adopted the new techniques of Satyagraha, the civil-disobedience movement, fasting and the boycott of foreign goods and with the help of these symbolic non-violent weapons he could spread patriotic ferver through the length and breadth of India. The whole of India stood like one man behind him, never have fought with his novel method of nonviolent struggle against the British imperialists Gandhiji became the most dynamic force in the political and spiritual life of India. The Indians could never have fought the gigantic British army by using force, because they could have suppressed it by using still greater force, which they commanded. Gandhiji's patriotism an nationalism made him the most vital force during the pre-independence period and his life and activities were identified with Indian's struggle for national independence. But his nationalism was not the narrow and aggressive nationalism which leads to territorial aggrendisement war and imperialism. He himself suggested a federal world state, based on self-determination of all people and economic

justice. He wrote in a French paper "my nationalism is intense internationalism." He had his support for all the people who were supressed and exploited by the imperial powers. In that sense he was a true internationalist. According to Dr. Ralph Bunehi, though Gandhiji's efforts were concentrated on India, he was a true internationalist. The Gandhian principles of truth and nonviolence have become universal principles. The broad universal aspect of Gandhiji's nationalism is evident from his article in "Young India" in 1924. "The greatest menace to the world to-day is the growing, exploiting, irresponsible imperialism which through the inslovement of India is threatening the dependent existence and expansion of the weaker races of the world. That imperialism is a negation of God."

Gandhiji's ideal society was a non-violent and a stateless society. Gandhiji realised that the greatest danger to human society is the ever increasing state power. He repudiated the state on ethical, historical and economic grounds. Gandhiji believed that the state is an embodiment of force and exploitation. The excessive interference of the state dried up

the springs of individual initiative and self reliance. He believed that the state originates in an essentially violent society and in a society where the people are non-violent and disciplined, the state becomes superfluous. Gandhiji wanted that all initiative must come from within the man. Anything that which is imposed by external agency is evil because it does not elevate the human soul. In his introduction to Thorean's Essay on civil Disobedience Gandhiji writes, "I heartily accept the motto. That Government is best which governs least........ carried out it finally amounts to this, which also I believe, 'That government is best which governs not at all." Instead of state activity he wanted self-directed activity. According to him the coercive methods adopted by the state rob the individual action of its morality. Both Thorean and Gandhiji looked upon the state as a soulless machine. The ideal society Gandhiji envisaged is a stataless democracy consiting of self-sufficing, self-regulating and self-governing village communities, joined together in a voluntary federation. Eventhough Gandhiji was a philosophical anarchist like Tolstoy, he did not dogmatise his concept and believed in the necessity of the welfare state for the

good of the community. In fact, Gandhiji's ideal state was a nonviolent democratic state, where social life would remain self-regulated. He wrote in 'Young India' that, "In such a state every one is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour. In the ideal state therefore, there is no political power, because there is no state. By state here he refers to the violent and the absolutistic state power. He advocated for a non-violent state and not for a non-violent state-less society as is generally believed. He was opposed to the coercive authority of the state and its exercise of absolute sovereignty.

Gandhiji was a great egalitarian and a socialist, but his socialism was different from the so-called 'socialism'. Gandhiji's socialism was based on the ideal of non-violence. He said emphatically that "the cruel inequality that obtained to-day would be removed by purely non-violent means." His idea of economic equality was that, "every one would have a proper house to live in, sufficient and balance food to eat, and sufficient Khadi with which to cover himself." He said that no one should consume more than that actually needs. Gandhiji

believed in the doctrine of limits. According to him the rich people should think themselves as trustees for the society and should voluntarily limit their property and practise self-renunciation. They should spend their property in the interest of the community as a whole. He wanted to achieve his goal of economic equality by changing the heart of the people by love and persuation. He urged the people to earn their livelihood through spinning and running their own small scale industries. He was opposed to the machine age which sub-ordinated the man to the machine. As far as India was concerned he wanted that the immense man-power and cattle-power should be utilised first, before turning to large scale industrialization. He despised concentration of power in both economic and political fields. Concentration of power and large scale production were considered as enemies of democracy. He therefore advocated for a net work of self-governing and self-sustaining village republics each one of them living an autonomous existence. Thus Gandhiji's socialism is religiously oriented and aims at the change of heart where as both socialism and communism believe in force for the socialistic transformation of the society. Compar-

ing Gandhi and Marx, Richard Gregg writes, "Both Gandhi and Marx were deeply moved by the injustice and the suffering of the poor. Marx reacted with indignation, anger and hatred of those in power. Gandhi reacted with compassion and love of all men. Marx was an angry man; Gandhi was a loving man. Marx advocated violence to right the worngs, Gandhi advocated and practised non-violent resistance and loving persuasion." Thus Gandhian socialism was a fusion of individualism, idealism and socialism. Socialism has always lead to regimentation and greater state control. But Gandhian socialism stands for versatility and decentralisation of power both in the economic and political spheres. He believed that greater industrialisation may produce more good, but does not neaessarily lead to moral progress. As a result of industrialisation there will be decline of personal and social morality, abundance of dishonesty, corruption and mepotism.

Gandhiji led a life of service and sacrifice. Besides being an egaliterian, he was a great humanist. He proclaimed what he held to be the truth, but did not exclude or condemn those who differed from him. Gandhi's humanism

was evident even in the unique manner of fighting his enemy. During his fight against the white Minority Government in South Africa for the right of the Indians, he and his followers were several times imprisoned, herded with criminals and treated as sub-human beings. But whenever the Governments which supressed him were weak and in trouble, instead of pressing for his own advantage he turned to their help. When they were involved in dangerous war, he organised a special crops of Indian stretcher bearers to help them. In the midst of a non-voilent strike by his followers when the Government was threatented by a revolutionary railway strike, he immediately gave orders for his people to reseume work, unitil his opponents were safe again.

Gandhiji believed that there is something of God in every man. He had insurmountable and almost child-like faith in the moral potentials of human character. The dying words of Jesus christ, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do" characterise the whole life and philosophy of Gandhiji. He had tremendous faith in the individual's capacity of moral regeneration. 'Love thy enemy' was

his slogan. In his own words; "The injunction, 'Love your enemy' is not only the noblest idealism, it is also the most practical politics."

Due to his humanism Gandhiji wanted to convience his opponents through love and persuasion. It was also his conviction that one could hate the evil without hating the evil-doer' This was proved from his relations with the Britishers. He said; "if my love is sincere I must love the English man inspite of my distrust." On another occasion he said; "I am fighting British imperialism, but I am not fighting the Britisher. I am not fighting the Englishman or anybody. They are my friends, but I will fight British imperialism."

Wherever man was expoilted and suppressed Gandhiji extended his unbounded sympathy and support. His concern for the misery and the exploitation of human beings led him to start a vigorous agitation against untouchability in whatever form it might be existing. He condemned the practice of untouchability and tried to break this unhealthy practice by such means as temple entry and continuous propaganda against it. His love for the suffering people all over the world is an idication of his great

heart and his humanism; "When all life is one and the whole universe including myself is a manifestation of God", Gandhiji asks, 'how may I regard any one as my enemy, a wicked being, one whom I am free to hate ? How may I feel afraid of or inspire fear in anyone ? How may I regard one as closer to me than other ? Thus Mahatma Gandhi's whole attitude was an attitude of love and self-less service. For him the entire sentient creation was a big family whose members are tied to one nother by bonds of love and service.

Gandhiji was a religious man and he said that if politics has to be a blessing for the mankind then it must be mixed with religion. For Gandhiji performance of some rituals or ceremony, visit to the temple or the church, kneeling before an image or idol and offering sacrifices or having faith in certain dogmas contained in the sacred books like the Vedas, the Bible or the Koran do not constitute the essence of religion. For him religion is a way of life directed towards the realisation of unity with the Supreme Being through the pursuit of Truth and the service of His creatures. According to Gandhiji, it is not sufficient to say that God

is Truth, we must also say that Truth is God. For Gandhiji secularism did not mean the complete elimination of religion from social, econmic and political life. Gandhiji's concept of religion finds its expression in the words of Swami Vivekananda, "that it is the realisation of divinity that is latest in man." When said that the religion should guide the public conduct, he did not mean that the political life of the people shonld be conducted in accordance with the tends of Hinduism or Islam or Christianity. He stresses the spiritualisation and the moralisation of our social, political and economic life which is the crying need of the hour. Gandhiji said that man should strive for the realisation of Absolute Truth and as long as he has not realized Absolute Truth he must held by the relative truth as it is conceived by him. Observance of truth is the quintessence of all religions and if people adhere to this principle in their public activities and their dealings with others then many of the evils noticed in the political, economic and social fields will be automatically eradicated. The artificial divorce between morality and politics, too much emphasis upon the material aspect of life, and the unbridgeale gap between

religion and life are some of the most important causes of the deterioration in the moral standard of the people. According to Gandhiji the neglect of the spiritual side of life would give rise to the following social sins : politics without principles; wealth without work; pleasure without conscience; Knowledge without character; Commerce without Morality, Science without Humanity; and worship without Sacrifice.

Printed by Sri Nikunja Kishore Das,
at the Gramsevak Samabaya Press, Cuttack-2

"ମୋର ଜୀବନ ହିଁ ମୋର ବାଣୀ"

× × × ×

"ମୁଁ ସୁବ୍ୟବସ୍ଥିତ ବୈପ୍ଳବିକ, ସାମାଜିକ ପୁନର୍ଗଠନର ପକ୍ଷପାତୀ । କିନ୍ତୁ ଏହାର ବିକାଶ ସେହି ସମାଜ ଭିତରୁ ସ୍ୱାଭାବିକ ଭାବରେ ହେବା ଉଚିତ । ଏହାକୁ ବଳପୂର୍ବକ ଉପରୁ ଲଦିଦେଇ ହେବନାହିଁ ।"

× × × ×

"ଶୋଷିତମାନଙ୍କର ସ୍ୱେଚ୍ଛାକୃତ କିମ୍ବା ଅନିଚ୍ଛାକୃତ ସହଯୋଗ ଉପରେ ହିଁ ସମସ୍ତ ଶୋଷଣ ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠିତ । ଏକଥା ସ୍ୱୀକାର କରିବାକୁ ଆମେ ଯେତେ ଘୃଣା କରୁ ପଛକେ ଲୋକମାନେ ଶୋଷକମାନଙ୍କର ଆଦେଶ ନ ମାନିଲେ କୌଣସି ଶୋଷଣ ସମ୍ଭବ ହେବନାହିଁ ।"

× × × ×

"ଶ୍ରେଣୀ ସଂଘର୍ଷର କଳ୍ପନା ମୋ ମନକୁ ପାଏନାହିଁ । ଅହିଂସାର ତାତ୍ପର୍ଯ୍ୟ ବୁଝିପାରିଲେ ଭାରତରେ ଶ୍ରେଣୀ ସଂଘର୍ଷକୁ ଆଡ଼େଇ ଦେଇହେବ । ଏହାର ପ୍ରୟୋଜନତାର ସ୍ଥାନ ନାହିଁ । ଯେଉଁମାନେ ଶ୍ରେଣୀ ସଂଘର୍ଷର ନିଶ୍ଚିତତାରେ ବିଶ୍ୱାସ କରନ୍ତି, ସେମାନେ ଅହିଂସାର ସାରମର୍ମକୁ ବୁଝିନାହାନ୍ତି କିମ୍ବା ଉପର ଠାଉରିଆ ଭାବରେ ବୁଝିଛନ୍ତି ।"

× × × ×

"ଅହିଂସାର ବିଜୟ ହେଉଛି ଅନ୍ତିମ ବିଜୟ ।"

—ଗାଂଧୀଜୀ